



Narratives Unbound

Historical Studies in Post-Communist
Eastern Europe

Edited by Sorin Antohi, Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

NARRATIVES UNBOUND
HISTORICAL STUDIES IN POST-COMMUNIST
EASTERN EUROPE

Pasts Incorporated
CEU Studies in the Humanities

Volume V

Series Editor
László Kontler

Pasts Incorporated
CEU STUDIES IN THE HUMANITIES

NARRATIVES UNBOUND

Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe

Edited by
Sorin Antohi, Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor



Central European University Press
Budapest New York

©2007 by Sorin Antohi, Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor

Published in 2007 by

CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

An imprint of the

Central European University Share Company

Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary

Tel: +36-1-327-3138 or 327-3000

Fax: +36-1-327-3183

E-mail: ceupress@ceu.hu

Website: www.ceupress.hu

400 West 59th Street, New York NY 10019, USA

Tel: +1-212-547-6932

Fax: +1-646-557-2416

E-mail: mgreenwald@sorosny.org

Published with the support of Pasts, Inc. Center for Historical Studies

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, without the permission
of the Publisher.

ISBN 963 7326 85 5

978-963-7326-85-1

ISSN 1786-1438

Pasts Incorporated

CEU STUDIES IN THE HUMANITIES

www.pasts.ceu.hu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Narratives unbound : historical studies in post-communist Eastern Europe / edited
by Sorin Antohi, Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor.—1st ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-9637326851 (cloth)

1. Europe, Eastern—Historiography. 2. Post-communism—Europe, Eastern. I.
Antohi, Sorin. II. Trencsényi, Balázs, 1973- III. Apor, Péter. IV. Title.

DJK32.N35 2007

947.00072—dc22

2007014233

Printed in Hungary by

Akaprint Nyomda

Contents

<i>Sorin Antohi: Narratives Unbound: A Brief Introduction to Post-Communist Historical Studies</i>	ix
--	----

<i>Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor: Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990s</i>	1
1. THE “PRE-HISTORY”: HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY BETWEEN 1945 AND 1989	1
2. THE NINETIES: THE CHANGING INFRASTRUCTURE	8
3. SOCIAL HISTORY AS HISTOIRE TOTALE	12
4. IN SEARCH OF A NEW INTELLECTUAL HISTORY	19
5. THE REVITALIZATION OF MEDIEVAL STUDIES	24
6. MENTALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES: EARLY-MODERN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY	29
7. BETWEEN REVOLUTION AND COMPROMISE: POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	32
8. SONDERWEG OR NATIONALIST MODERNIZATION? FROM THE TURN OF THE CENTURY TO 1945	37
9. JEWISH HISTORY AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DEBATES ON ANTI-SEMITISM	46
10. THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL IMAGE OF THE COMMUNIST PERIOD . . .	50
11. OVERLAPPING PASTS: HUNGARY AND ITS NEIGHBORS	55
12. CONCLUSION: PLURALITY INCORPORATED?	59
NOTES	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

<i>Maciej Górny: From the Splendid Past into the Unknown Future: Historical Studies in Poland after 1989</i>	101
1. ANALYSIS OF THE PRE-1989 SITUATION	107

2. REDEFINITION OF THE DISCIPLINE SINCE 1990: CORE THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS	112
3. EVERYDAY LIFE AND THE SOCIAL IMAGINARY: MEDIEVAL AND EARLY–MODERN STUDIES	114
4. THE SHAPING OF NATIONS	116
5. DEALING WITH A DIFFICULT PAST: THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY	120
6. FROM A MINEFIELD TO A RESEARCH AREA: THE HISTORY OF PRL	122
7. PUBLIC AND ACADEMIC DEBATES	123
8. THE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY: INSTITUTIONS, ASSOCIATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS	133
9. THE PRESENCE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES IN OTHER MEDIA	140
10. FUNDING AND ITS CONSEQUENCES	141
11. CONCLUSIONS	142
NOTES	144
BIBLIOGRAPHY	149

Pavel Kolář and Michal Kopeček: A Difficult Quest for

<i>New Paradigms: Czech Historiography After 1989</i>	<i>173</i>
1. INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS	176
2. MAIN TRENDS IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY	181
3. THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY–MODERN PERIOD: FROM STRUCTURAL HISTORY TO HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY?	187
4. IN SEARCH FOR ‘SOCIETAL HISTORY:’ STUDIES ON THE LONG 19 TH CENTURY	193
5. BETWEEN HISTORY AND POLITICS: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE 20TH CENTURY	200
6. THE INTER-WAR PERIOD: THE STRUGGLE FOR THE ‘FIRST REPUBLIC’	202
7. WORLD WAR II AND THE HOLOCAUST	206
8. TRANSFER OR EXPULSION?	210
9. THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP	217
10. CONCLUSION: IN SEARCH OF NEW PARADIGMS	223
NOTES	226
BIBLIOGRAPHY	235

<i>Zora Hlavičková: Wedged Between National and Trans-National History: Slovak Historiography in the 1990s</i>	249
1. IN SEARCH OF NATIONAL HISTORY	249
2. CHANGES AFTER 1989: INSTITUTIONS, RESEARCH VENUES, PUBLICATIONS	253
3. THE TRANSITION AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS	258
4. THEMES AND APPROACHES	261
5. THE PLURALITY OF VOICES: HISTORICAL REGIONS AND NATIONALITIES	272
6. HISTORIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH	281
7. CONCLUSIONS	284
NOTES	286
BIBLIOGRAPHY	296

<i>Cristina Petrescu and Dragoș Petrescu: Mastering vs. Coming to Terms with the Past: A Critical Analysis of Post-Communist Romanian Historiography</i>	311
1. HISTORY AND POLITICS: THE LEGACY OF COMMUNIST HISTORIOGRAPHY	314
2. HISTORY WRITING AFTER 1989: THE SLOW PACE OF RENEWAL	317
3. SYNTHESSES OF ROMANIAN HISTORY: NEW AND NOT SO NEW SCHOLARSHIP	320
4. THE DEMYTHOLOGIZING TURN	323
5. FROM THE DUSK OF ANTIQUITY TO THE DAWN OF MODERNITY	326
6. FROM HABSBURGS AND PHANARIOTS TO THE FIRST WORLD WAR	334
7. DEBATES ON GREATER ROMANIA	343
8. INTERPRETATIONS OF ROMANIAN FASCISM	346
9. CONTROVERSIES OVER THE HOLOCAUST IN ROMANIA	347
10. ETHNIC MINORITIES IN ROMANIA: THEIR HISTORY AND THEIR RIGHTS	351
11. APPROACHES TO THE COMMUNIST PAST	352
12. PUBLIC DEBATES: HISTORY AND EDUCATION	365
13. CONCLUSIONS	369
NOTES	372
BIBLIOGRAPHY	392

<i>Ivan Elenkov and Daniela Koleva: Historical Studies in Post-Communist Bulgaria. Between Academic Standards and Political Agendas</i>	409
1. POLITICAL CONTEXTS, INSTITUTIONS AND PROJECTS: 1944–1989	410
2. THE POST-1989 SITUATION	428
3. (NEW) THEMES AND DISCOURSES	432
4. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS	445
5. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT	457
6. THE DEBATE ON FASCISM: A CASE STUDY ON THE CONDITION AND PERSPECTIVES OF BULGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY.	459
7. CONCLUSIONS	464
NOTES	465
BIBLIOGRAPHY	474
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	487

Sorin Antohi

Narratives Unbound: A Brief Introduction to Post-Communist Historical Studies

No introduction, however extensive and detailed, can take care of a book's richness and complexity. Also, unlike many of today's books which (at best) tend to be opportunistic, blown-up extensions of articles, this volume, whose more abstract and general claims should not be disentangled from the enormous quantity of relevant details, cannot be summed up. Moreover, a summary would be against my conviction that the steps towards a history of European historical studies, let alone towards a global history of historical studies, ought to include empirically-based, theoretically sound, reflexive, comparative, intercultural works on the countries and (sub)regions whose cultural, intellectual, academic contributions have been less present on the international arena, have not made it into the global canon, have been collateral victims in the cultural wars of our age. From this point of view, Eastern Europe is a curious case.¹ It has not embraced (with a few exceptions) the post-colonial paradigm (possibly because the pride of local scholars is still stronger than their strategic skills and their anti-Western *ressentiment*), this extraordinarily empowering and subverting offspring of postmodernism. It has not invented any other post-Cold War cultural-ideological formula to 'package' and 'market' its regional identity. Rather, Eastern Europe has embarked on a program of erasing Europe's demi-Orientalist symbolic geography (complete with a demi-Orientalist and self-Orientalizing symbolic geography of knowledge production).² Thus, as all-Europeans, or EU-ropeans, many Eastern Europeans hope to shed their entrenched complexes and long histories of ambiguous in-betweenness (neither Occidental, nor Oriental), and become standard Europeans or, in other words, as banal and inconspicuous as their Western betters. In the process, their specificities come to be played down or largely overlooked, can be readily translated into the categories of a West in which

Eastern Europeans now seem superficially absorbed, and included into a Western-based normative saga as footnotes, counter-examples, executive summaries. Our book takes another approach. It is precisely in the name of our affinities and similarities with Western Europe that we insist on our differences and peculiarities. And we try to explain them to ourselves while explaining them to everybody else.

THIS BOOK

This is the first work which covers the post-Communist development of historical studies in six Eastern European countries from a comparative and critical perspective. It is written and coordinated by scholars from the region itself, and is part of a larger, long-term comparative program. Most contributors to this book belong to the young-to-midcareer generation and were working closely with me, a midcareer-to-senior scholar, so that a certain generational dynamics be integrated in a common process of ‘coming to terms’ with the recent history of historical studies.³

The six book chapters can be read independently by the specialists of any of the six countries under scrutiny. However, a better use can be made of any of the chapters if read in conjunction with others and with the whole book. In the following two sections of my introduction, I explain why this is so. Consequently, this volume could be used by scholars as a building block for a history of European and global historical studies; as a heuristic reference for similar projects; as a pedagogical means for classes in the history of historical studies, both in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. To keep the book within a certain size limit (however generous), and in order to avoid confusion due to the amalgamation of entries that are frequently country-specific, we have not included a general index, nor a general bibliography. Each individual chapter has numerous and detailed notes and references. They should be amply sufficient for all scholarly and educational purposes, and could guide further research. The order of the chapters is not alphabetical, but rather (symbolic-)geographical, as we wanted to facilitate a modular reading of the book by groups of countries that share certain subregional features.

While our focus has been on the first post-Communist decade, 1989-1999, the book offers, to various degrees in various cases, a longer-term perspective that includes the immediate ‘prehistory’ of that

momentous decade as well as its *posthistoire*. *Narratives Unbound* is the overarching trope that captures our perspective on the transformations in post-Communist Eastern European historical studies. It also captures the spirit of 1989, that heady mix of elation, surprise, determination, and hope. In another context, someone has used a very apt phrase to describe a similar spirit: *l'ivresse du possible*. This is the paradoxical beginning of Eastern European post-Communism: ushered in by 'anti-Utopian' revolutions, and slowly finding its course towards a bureaucratic, imitative, challenging, and anachronistic restoration of a capitalism that had changed almost beyond recognition when it had mutated into the negative double of Communism, for a short while it couldn't help dreaming of chimeras and sudden, hedonistic, 'real' Utopias. Or at least of endless possibilities. A question mark—*Narratives Unbound?*—would have probably been in order, too. But that punctuation sign in the title could have seemed more than an indication of reasonable doubt. It would have looked almost like a conclusion. As we have learned from literary theorists, narratives, and especially master narratives, are spectacularly resilient. Moreover, they are inscribed in vast webs of intertextuality, in inertial flows of discourse, in *longue durée* orders of meaning. Is a revolution enough to introduce a radical break in such continuities of theory and practice? Are historical studies, this conglomerate of disciplines and discourses, capable of quick changes? While such questions are legitimate and appropriate, I believe that at least one thing was accomplished by historians during the revolutions of 1989 and thereafter: they broke free from the tyranny of the mandatory, regulated intertextuality imposed by the Party, and conquered the right to speak their mind, to tell the stories they wanted, the way they wanted. For many historians, even well-intended, this might not be a major concern, as most blindly believe in the 'objectivity' of their trade, in their own *Wissenschaftlichkeit*. For some historians, and for some segments of their societies, this freedom—including narrative freedom, from the choice of heroes and events to the choice of modes of emplotment—was vital. Our book speaks of them all, but has a bias in favor of the latter.

THE BACKGROUND

The fall of state Communism in Eastern Europe has triggered dramatic if arguably superficial and short-lived changes in the region's 'endemic'

existential and philosophical attitudes to history as well as in the scholarly study and writing of history. The early 1990s witnessed the rise of a wide spectrum of new public and professional discourses on history and historical studies, ranging from Fukuyama-styled revivals of Kojévian-Hegelian ideas about the End of History to strong claims that History was back, reborn or resurrected after decades of Utopian ahistorical void and Cold War deep freeze. Oddly enough, Fukuyama's vision of (US) Democracy Triumphant was favorably read or at least quoted in Eastern Europe despite its RAND and Disneyland underpinnings, which were running counter to the traditional local styles of historical thought and history writing, shaped largely by nationalism, positivism, cultural pessimism, self-victimization and self-stigmatization. Precisely for such reasons, it was the Huntingtonian model of the Clash of Civilizations, as well as its lingering Spenglerian spirit (already absorbed and emulated by Eastern European cultures before WWII), that became more pervasive in the region. Underneath the relatively thin veneer of such 'metahistorical' (in a pre-Hayden White sense, closer to Toynbee and 'historiosophy') ruminations and conversations, which were more popular in the media (freshly elevated to the role of open public forum after decades of Party control) and among the literati (galvanized by their own canonical revisions and ready to ignite fully-fledged cultural wars, in the tradition of what Alexis de Tocqueville used to call "a literary and abstract politics") than among professional historians, most of the latter continued their business-as-usual activities. As in other parts of the world, historical theory and methodology are considered in Eastern Europe an arcane exercise in speculation and futility. "Real" historians do not bother about such irrelevant mind games, and leave them to philosophers, literary theorists, anthropologists, and other such speculation-inclined scholars. The professional and educational canon of historical studies, let us not forget, ascribes theory and methodology a marginal role (if any). Unfortunately, most historical theorists reciprocate, and do not read much "real" history, consequently aggravating the misunderstanding that institutes a cleavage between *history* and *theory*.

On their most abstract level, the scant post-Communist Eastern European canonical debates in the field of historical studies were mainly epistemological and ethical, focusing on the possibility of defining and restoring historical truth, and resulting in various revisionisms: a mythology of exhaustive archival research as a means of uncovering long-sup-

pressed histories and collective memories, and ultimately the unique, pure, ideology-free, (almost) metaphysical Truth; the plea for the making of *the* normative historical narrative that would replace both the national vulgate (crafted by the nineteenth-century Romantics, and radicalized by the inter-war conservatives and right wingers) and the (Communist) Party narrative of the nation's history, as well as its derivatives; a sudden vogue of oral history, recent history, women's history, of other methods and sub-disciplines perceived by some (mainly younger) historians as alternative to the previously unchallenged master narratives and more likely to successfully bridge the history and memory gap between the 'normal', 'organic' pre-1945 national history and the post-1989 perceived 'come-back' of that history's logic, sense, meaning, and dynamics.

On a more popular level, concern with historical truth as a way out of the Communist predicament and legacy was expressed in the media and fought over by 'memorians', politicians, spin doctors, scholars. Two major public controversies have rocked post-Communist Eastern Europe, although neither of them has amounted to an articulate *Historikerstreit*: the polemic about the newly-reintroduced alternative history textbooks and that on the open access to and normative interpretation of recent history.⁴

Since the collapse of state Communism in Europe, history textbooks have undergone substantial changes in the former Soviet bloc. In many ways, these changes were inevitable and spontaneous, as Communist imposition had turned history textbooks and most history teachers into ancillary propaganda instruments meant to disseminate an Orwellian version of history. In the Romanian case, for instance, the new national vulgate, predicated on rudimentary Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist historical materialism in the late 1940s and in the 1950s, had started to retool itself by adopting elements of the national and even of the nationalistic inter-war historiography, amounting in some countries to that mutant hybrid, national Communism. After 1989, the obvious first move in the 'people's democracies' seemed to be the rejection of the Party (master, or meta-) narrative, and a pious revival of pre-Communist textbooks, deemed 'objective', 'true', 'national'. Eventually, after months of hesitation—during which Communist textbooks were used, stripped of their most blatant symbols (such as the portraits of Party bosses)—, the ministry of Education reprinted inter-war history textbooks, usually afflicted by the symmetrically ruinous right-wing propaganda.

Ironically, while the generations educated prior to the educational ‘reforms’ of the late 1940s but brainwashed by Communist regimes had trouble accepting alternative textbooks despite their having used them, the new media tenors of post-Communist democracy were joining in the refusal of alternative textbooks on ‘commonsensical’ grounds supported by the paleo-positivistic epistemology shared (often ‘innocently’) by professional historians, and in the name of public morality. Thus, the rare critically minded historians who would advocate, and/or write alternative textbooks were up against their societies, with the exception of the equally rare, if more vocal, pro-Western NGOs lacking scholarly expertise. More ironically, it was not the new physics or mathematics alternative textbooks that generated public outrage, but rather the history ones. Apparently, ordinary citizens and politicians (let alone the majority of professional historians) could handle the otherwise scandalous idea that hard sciences were taught differently in different textbooks; after all, one could say, as physicists still use the Newtonian paradigm after Einstein, so should laymen accept epistemological pluralism in textbooks—i.e., in the realm of the undisputed Truth *ad usum delphini*. What most people could not accept as easily was the idea that national history may be presented in a variety of ways. The popular mind, the public spirit (whatever they might be) appeared to be more comfortable with relativism in the ‘exact’ sciences. In history, even ‘relative relativism’—to quote Hayden White’s tongue-in-cheek self-definition—was not tolerated. In the field of individual memory, which was usually conflated with national history, post-Communism brought about significant revisions—like in the West, the generational dynamics of social memory turns all historical actors into *post factum* heroes of democratic resistance to dictatorship. But what was tacitly accepted in the case of individuals—autobiographical revisionism—, was excitedly rejected in the case of the nation. Like the Party narrative, the national vulgate is a very rigorously normative master narrative. A master narrative indeed: that is, simultaneously bound and binding.⁵

Nevertheless, as post-Communist societies were also confronting more vital challenges, public controversies over the alternative history textbooks subsided in the early 2000s, after peaking in the 1990s, when elected politicians would routinely call for the burning at the stake of those textbooks that were ‘deconstructing’ – even prudently – the idols

of the tribe. Gradually, public attention shifted its focus towards recent history.

Recent history and the study thereof have occupied the center-stage in post-Communist historical studies since the early 1990s, and have become the most visible public concern with history as well as the lens through which the region's present and future are currently seen. Prior to the accession to the European Union, most countries of the former Soviet bloc have opened their historical archives to domestic and foreign researchers. To be sure, access to archives is still problematic in many cases, starting with access to the former Party and political police documents; some of these archival holdings have been tampered with one way or the other since 1989; under various pretexts, ranging from a counterintuitive (but self-interested) official respect for international archival regulations (even a thirty-year ban on access to classified documents spares the current political elites any trouble) to the classification of documents as national security-related, some deposits have been declared off-limits for researchers. Nonetheless, the revelations and scandals related to legal or illegal access to Party and political police archival documents have been significant in all Eastern European countries, occasionally amounting to purges in the higher ranks of elected or appointed elites, from leaders of political parties and government officials to Church hierarchs, media personalities, and academics.

While on the popular and political levels the attention for recent history is almost entirely related to the societal thirst for retroactive justice (from *damnatio memoriae* to property restitution, legal rehabilitation, financial compensation, prosecution of war and political police criminals, etc.), current political fighting (with lustration as maximalist strategy and blackmail as routine), generational wars, and sheer human curiosity, on the scholarly level the conversation revolves around the usual standards of the historical profession. But, under the circumstances, recent history as a subfield of historical studies is still struggling for scholarly legitimacy (a debate familiar to Western historians of the recent past, especially in France), competes with other disciplines for its objects of study and methodologies (e.g., with political science, cultural anthropology, sociology), and—something specific to Eastern Europe—needs to work out a way of simultaneously dealing with several problematic pasts that can hardly be dissociated from one another

and from the present. The bitter debates on the comparability of and the (disturbingly competitive) comparisons between the Holocaust and the Gulag, as well as on the priority of the study of one over the study of the other, are symptoms of a deeper academic and societal difficulty in handling such sensitive issues, still painful and history-shaping. Moreover, the overt political stakes, affiliations, and strategies have made it impossible, more than in other areas of historical studies, to even mention the separation of scholarship from politics and societal pressures. An institutional and political map of all the competing institutes of national memory and recent history in Romania or a contrast between the alternative narratives and memory canons related to 1956 in Hungary or to 1968 in the Czech Republic and Slovakia would easily substantiate my claim. In our book, while paying special attention to all these issues and their contexts and ramifications, we have tried to integrate the analysis of recent history as a distinct subfield in the overall analysis of historical studies.⁶

THE PROJECT

Like many other idealistic initiatives to subvert and eventually dismantle the Cold War cognitive and symbolic organization of the world, post-1989 'East-West dialogues' among historians have rapidly stumbled against a number of serious obstacles. The Iron Curtain has never managed to institute an airtight separation between the two parts of our continent, while every corner of our planet, despite the heterogeneity due to the diverse itineraries towards or away from successful or failed 'multiple modernities', participates (albeit in specific local and regional ways) in the same 'regime of historicity'. Nevertheless, mutual communication and understanding between the West and the East, and—to focus on our topic at hand—the emergence of an integrated critical European historical narrative (beyond both national *Sonderwege* and EU political correctness) have been jeopardized by the scarcity of reliable intellectual tools ranging from comprehensive histories of historical writing to comparative empirical, theoretical, methodological syntheses of European history. While a putative European memory is being crafted in the offices of the European Commission by means of official *lieux de mémoire* (days of commemoration and celebration, monuments, museums, hagiographies, textbooks, etc.), good reference works on the

comparative history of Europe and on the comparative history of European historical studies are still very exceptional. Half a generation after the *annus mirabilis* 1989, when the equivalence between the notions 'EU' and 'Europe' has become significantly less preposterous than before the 2004-2007 wave of accession, it would be about time to put more such books on the table.

In order to modestly contribute to this effort, and more pressing-ly in order to answer to the scholarly and educational challenges of a growing transnational community of scholars, I have initiated and/or participated in a number of complementary projects in the history of historical writing. This project is the first of them. Its origins can be located at Central European University (CEU), and can be dated back to the late 1990s. In that particular site of learning, at that particular time, a number of students and faculty from many countries, both Western and Eastern, have embarked on the ambitious enterprise of a comparative history of historical studies in Eastern Europe. This was an inevitable addition to the existing core activities of CEU's Department of History, a graduate program of comparative history focusing on Central, Eastern, and South Eastern Europe, dealing with Western Europe as an implicit or explicit constitutive (but not normative) comparison, and also looking to other historical regions for comparative inspiration. Thanks to a generous grant from the CEU Research Board, I later launched a collective research project, "Historical Studies in Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe. The State of the Art", on which this book is based. I selected the first possible collaborators from among the many promising young scholars trained at CEU, as I wanted to tap the precious resources of a group that had been socialized in a transnational comparative and collaborative ethos, rooted in both intellectual curiosity and civic engagement. Gradually, the group was expanded as to include the like-minded peers of these young CEU-affiliated scholars, wherever we could find them in the world. In the beginning, in the early 2000s, our plan was to cover the changes in historical studies in the entire post-Communist world. It seemed as if we could end up with a detailed map of that decade of momentous transformations, 1989-1999, including quantitative and descriptive information on topics, methods and theories, authors, 'schools', educational, research and publishing infrastructure, as well as with a thorough analytical and critical comparative presentation of the core debates, orientations, canons,

academic output, historical cultures (focusing on contested memories, presences of the past, etc.). Such an overly ambitious blueprint was not singular.⁷

Ultimately, due to the usual hazards of all collective academic undertakings, and especially due to more realistic self-evaluation and to concerns with the plausible and feasible proportions and depth of our coverage, the project was scaled down and concentrated on six countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia. It became obvious that the former countries of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, respectively, had to be dealt with separately, probably by other teams. Nonetheless, our original ambitions have loomed large on the horizon of our smaller project, in several ways. Firstly, we have kept up with and let ourselves inspired by all the important similar projects devoted to the countries (and geopolitical, cultural, academic ‘worlds’) we had to leave out. Secondly, we have decided to keep the initial map of Eastern Europe for the project devoted to recent history (see footnote 5). Thirdly, we have better highlighted both the commonalities and the differences revealed by our work on the smaller set of countries, more aware as we became of their irreducible specificities.

This project has been a collective work in progress for several years, a ‘site’ of learning, debating, writing, unwriting, and rewriting. Like similar endeavors, located at CEU or with a strong CEU participation, it has institutionalized an intensive form of comparative work—shall I call it *interactive comparison*?—which I find innovative and productive. Over the years, this approach has been evolving from an early stage of implicit comparison (as we know from Marc Bloch, all history is implicitly comparative) and passive comparison (systematically relating new knowledge on a previously unknown or little known case to one’s own case study) to an *histoire croisée* perspective (as theorized by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann), to asymmetric comparison (as theorized by Jürgen Kocka), on to a history of contacts, transfers, and entanglements (as pioneered by Hartmut Kaelble and others, as described by Johannes Paulmann), and to the more recently-developed transnational history (as analyzed by authors such as Michael McGerr, and as undertaken in Germany). Throughout the work on this project and on its parallels, the entire team has paid special attention to developments in the history of historiography, ranging from modern classics such as those authored and/or edited by Georg G. Ig-

gers, Ernst Breisach, Wolfgang Küttler, Jörn Rüsen, Ernst Schulin, and others in the 1990s to the recent contributions to the comparative study of history and historiographies due to scholars such as Jürgen Kocka, Jörn Rüsen, Chris Lorenz. In our own reflection, additional insights were gained by means of a continuous engagement with comparative methodologies and notions (e.g., the unit of comparison, the limits of comparability, etc.) from other disciplines, starting with comparative literature and cultural anthropology. In the same spirit, we have built on our region's traditions in comparative history, ranging from the century-old *Südostforschung* to the recent contributions of scholars such as Miroslav Hroch. One regional specificity—the experience of and reflection on our ethnic, linguistic, confessional, national, cultural histories and historical narratives (overlapping, interlocking, contested, competing, at times mutually exclusive)—made us ponder on our region's palimpsestic and short-distance entanglements and 'co-dependencies', determined by both close-range, direct interaction, and by 'triangulation' with common or diverging Western influences, transfers, models, hegemonies, interventions. We have also benefited from participating in and reflecting on other ongoing projects, larger or smaller, more tentative and experimental, among which those trying to 'falsify' the received wisdom of European comparative history by means of novel comparative frameworks going against the grain of bibliographies and symbolic geographies—e.g., the comparison between South Eastern Europe and Nordic Europe or the intercultural study of Eastern European literary exile to the West.

At various stages of this project, all participants have answered a detailed questionnaire, to ensure a certain mutual intelligibility, complementarity, and easier cross-referencing (we have finally decided to drop most visible traces of these structural constraints and leave out the most cumbersome 'hard' data as the book manuscript threatened to reach one thousand pages); have read and critiqued each other's contributions; have presented our individual and team research questions and findings at numerous workshops and conferences; have systematically shared with our colleagues the latest additions to the relevant bibliographies, especially those coming out in our countries' 'vernaculars', frequently in small-circulation publications. Consequently, while refraining from any attempt to 'standardize' individual contributions, each and every one of the country reports produced in the project and now

published as book chapters reflects and incorporates a long, intense 'history' of comparative and methodological-theoretical teamwork, rooted in a common intellectual program and facilitated by a unique common socialization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank all those institutions and persons who have contributed in any way to the project and the present volume. Generous funding from the CEU Research Board made the project possible. Cristina Petrescu and Dragoş Petrescu, my project assistants, have been instrumental in launching the intricate networking process and managing its early stages. The staff at CEU (central administration, History Department, Pasts, Inc. Center for Historical Studies) have accompanied us through the years, taking care of everything from conference logistics to reimbursements. Colleagues and staff members elsewhere have hosted several individual presentations and panels growing from and feeding back into the project. The students in my CEU Winter 2006 class, "Historical Studies in Post-Communist Europe. History, Theory, Ideology, Politics", have been reading and discussing this book's draft chapters, as long as a number of empirical, theoretical, and methodological publications, contributing relevant comments and more case studies. Let them all be thanked.

I owe special thanks to my co-editors, Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor. They have taken over from Cristina and Dragoş the management of the second stage of the project; have assisted me greatly in the communication with the other contributors, and in the overall coordination of their output. Crucially, they have been in constant touch with both the contributors and the publisher, seeing the book manuscript through its last 'incarnations'. To put it simply: this book would have not been finished without Balázs and Péter. For their entire assistance and support, let them be thanked.

Last but not least, I would like to thank István Bart, Linda Kunos, Péter Inkei, and the entire team at CEU Press, for bearing with me for so long, for encouraging us and for helping us produce this book out of a considerably larger, long overdue manuscript.

NOTES

- 1 In this text, 'Eastern Europe' is a shorthand for the 'region formerly known as Eastern Europe'. It includes approximative symbolic-geographical (sub)regions such as Central Europe, South Eastern Europe, Eastern Europe. More technically, Eastern Europe has come to mean the former Soviet Union area. While this book only covers six countries from Central and South Eastern Europe, we decided to use as a common descriptor the less precise, but more evocative and less cumbersome phrase, 'Eastern Europe'.
- 2 'Demi-Orientalism' was a notion used by Larry Wolff in his book, *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994) to designate the use of what Edward Said had termed 'Orientalism' within Europe, essentially to 'other' non-Western Europe.
- 3 Several publications have covered similar and/or related areas and topics. In English, the first attempt to take stock of the whole matter was the section, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe", hosted by *The American Historical Review* in 1992 (Volume 97, No. 4). A very prestigious lineup of historians sign country reports on Poland (Piotr S. Wandycz), Czechoslovakia (Jiří Kořálka), Hungary (István Deák), Romania (Keith Hitchins), Yugoslavia (Ivo Banac), Bulgaria (Maria Todorova). For obvious reasons, the articles cover only the early beginnings of post-Communist historical studies, their lasting merit being excellent background analyses and information on the pre-1989, even pre-Communist historical writing. More recently, Ulf Brunnbauer has edited an excellent book on the basis of a project based at the University of Graz, under the leadership of Karl Kaser: *(Re)writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004). The book is a great complement to this one, as it covers, alongside Bulgaria and Romania, Albania and ex-Yugoslavia.
- 4 A third class of polemics and controversies links scholarly studies in historical mythology, the social imaginary, historical memory, historical theory, and historical culture to political controversies and to the post-Communist tendency to smash all idols, including those of the tribe; this 'iconoclastic turn', to give it a name, runs parallel to an attempt to 'reload' the clichés of Romantic, nationalistic, and national Communist historical narratives, usually in connection to such diverse ingredients as irredentism, anti-Semitism, racism, conspiracy theories, New Age reworkings of the theological-political traditions of each nation state, etc. Breaking the 'code' of national history has become a rather popular pastime in Eastern Europe, and may be the 'highest and last stage' of the popular interest in history. Historical studies as an academic discipline and as a discourse are, alas, no match for such powerful shapers of the public spirit as the (populist) media, historical whodunits, 'uncivil religions' of historical inspiration, thriving revisionist web

sites, and the like. The most sophisticated such debates have taken place in Romania, mainly ignited by Lucian Boia's work on national mythology. To this date, however, the debate has not run its entire theoretical course, has not fulfilled its subversive potential, and has been successfully 'contained' by the trade's gatekeepers.

- 5 This section on history textbooks is largely taken from an earlier text of mine, "History Textbooks in the Public Sphere", originally published in the booklet based on a textbook exhibition (organized by Răzvan Pârâianu and Péter Apor), a scholarly panel, a public debate, and other related activities co-sponsored by the German and French embassies in Budapest and Collegium Budapest, in the framework of the international conference, "Historical Studies: Disciplines and Discourses", October 21-24, 2004, CEU, Budapest. I convened this conference together with Jürgen Kocka, Chris Lorenz, Jörn Rüsen, and Hayden White. The massive event was hosted and funded by CEU's Past, Inc. Center for Historical Studies. The concept of the conference and of several related publications had been developed from the late 1990s on, and had been first tried out in the format of a CEU SUN summer course I directed with Jörn Rüsen, "The State of the Art in Historical Studies. Putting Theories into Practices" (1999).
- 6 The study and writing of recent history have been tackled in another project I initiated at CEU over the last few years. So far, the project has yielded several conferences and workshops, individual conference presentations, lectures, and publications, as well as a CEU course.
- 7 My own first attempt at telling the (short) story of historical studies in Eastern Europe has been comforted by even wider vistas. Thus, on November 30-December 1, 2000, I was invited to Dresden by NATO and *Nature* to speak about "The Social Sciences and the Humanities in Central and Eastern Europe: Recent Trends and Opportunities", a daunting, surreal task that was being undertaken by Paul Baltes for Western Europe. See—especially for an analysis of the wide Eastern European scholarly context in post-Communism—my chapter with that title in Quirin Schiermeier, Judith Ockenden, eds., *Perspectives of Science in Central and Eastern Europe. Emerging Directions from the Past Ten Years* (Amsterdam, etc.: IOS Press-Ohmsha, NATO Science Series, 2001), 159-172. In January 2002, I was invited at Collegium Budapest to talk about historical studies 'only', in connection with their wider project, conducted in connection with the Informations Zentrum Sozialwissenschaften (Berlin), the Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (Vienna), the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (Paris), "The State of Three Social Science Disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe" (the project was covering political science, economics, and sociology—also monitored by the European Commission—, but opened itself to less 'scientific' disciplines, such as history). I addressed the topic on other occasions, most importantly in two keynote lectures: "Historical Studies in Central and Eastern Europe: Are They Really Changing?" (in the confer-

ence, “Changing Historical Studies in Central and Eastern Europe: How Does Methodological Transfer Generate New Research”, Budapest, October 26-28, 2001); “Party Narratives, National Vulgates, and Beyond. Historical Studies in Post-Communist Eastern Europe” (in the conference, “Framing the Historian. National, Institutional and Social Grand Narratives in East and West”, Berlin, October 24-27, 2002); both events were part of the series of joint conferences organized by CEU’s History Department and the *Berliner Kolleg für die Vergleichende Geschichte Europas*. From among the ongoing mega-projects I am involved with one way or the other, sometimes alongside one of the contributors to this book, two are an indication that scholarly ambitions are not dwindling: “Representations of the Past: National Histories in Europe” (led by Stefan Berger and a stellar cast of historians from several countries); and the “Oxford History of Historical Writing” (a seven-volume reference work under the general editorship of Daniel Woolf, and mobilizing more than one hundred contributors from all inhabited continents).

Balázs Trencsényi and Péter Apor

Fine-Tuning the Polyphonic Past: Hungarian Historical Writing in the 1990s

For better or for worse, due to the relatively smooth political transition of 1989, and also to the—in regional comparison rather unusual level of—cultural tolerance in the 1980s, the situation of Hungarian historiography in the 1990s fell as far as possible from being a comfortable *tabula rasa*. Both in themes and personnel, one can witness a stronger continuity than in most of the other former socialist countries, and even in some other disciplines in Hungary itself, like philosophy, where 1989 opened the gates of the universities for an entire generation of dissidents, who were institutionally rather marginal before.

This does not mean, however, that the life of the historical profession in the 1990s was utterly peaceful, or without remarkable events. In fact, the growth of political, methodological, and institutional pluralism opened up new venues, and the considerable cohesiveness of the “guild” was challenged from different angles. Consequently, the main focus of our paper will be the transformation of political, intellectual, and social history, but we have structured it into “chronological” cross-sections through which these shifts can be most conveniently analyzed. Apart from mapping the most important discourses and individual achievements, our main aim is to link the shift of historiographical and methodological paradigms to the transformations in the (meta-) political and institutional context.

1. THE “PRE-HISTORY”: HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY BETWEEN 1945 AND 1989

Throughout the modern history of Hungary, the production of historical knowledge has been closely related to the contemporary constellation of political power.¹ This becomes apparent if we look at the two

historiographical master-narratives that emerged in the late-19th century: the “independentist” liberal-nationalist and the pro-Habsburg orientations. The two narratives were rooted in divergent institutional, denominational (Protestant vs. Catholic), and political (critics and supporters of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867) traditions and structured Hungarian historiographical production for long decades, well into the 20th century. Curiously, some elements of this duality became replicated even in the ambiguous relationship of Stalinist cultural policy towards the national historiographical canon, leading to the simultaneous existence of a potential “national Communist” narrative, defining the Party as the legitimate heir of the early-modern and national romantic discursive tradition of “independentism,” but at the same time seeking to redefine these struggles in terms of a social conflict.

This ambiguity marked the historiography of the post-1956 regime as well, as the fierce debates at the turn of the decade led to a relative pluralism of interpretative keys concerning the “meaning of national history.” In the meantime, however, the original counter-position was over-written with various other distinctions, although for a long time the divergence of opinions on issues like the Compromise of 1867 served as a litmus test to locate historians on the “meta-political” spectrum. It is an extremely interesting question why the emerging post-Communist historiography failed to re-institutionalize these two traditions. The reason for the eventual blurring of this conflict can be found in the osmotic personal and institutional interaction of different *loci* of historical production, the professionalization of historiography, the structural homogenization of historical writing and, at the same time, the structural decentering of the national narrative throughout the Communist period, which simply made it virtually impossible to return *en masse* to these two narratives. It is from this perspective that the impact of the changes in historiography caused by the Communist regime gains special importance.

Needless to say, both variants of the Communist regime—before and after the seminal point of 1956—intended to institutionalize historical production to the extent that it would generate interpretations appropriate for the purposes of power. The re-arrangement of the structure of historical education and scholarship began in the autumn of 1948, right after the foundation of the new Party monolith: the Hun-

garian Workers' Party. Between 1945 and 1948, the *intermezzo* of political pluralism witnessed an impressive variety of historical approaches from *Geistesgeschichte* through positivist social history to the not yet totally homogenized Marxist narrative. Beginning in 1948, however, the Communist leadership set out to control and centralize the field of science. The purpose of the new power-center was to form a system of dependence based on well-organized lines of client-patron relations. Its first measure was the re-arrangement of the national-level management of science. The old Academy of Sciences, which was an autonomous institution, could not be simply appropriated for Party purposes, since formally Hungary was still governed by a coalition of parties. Therefore, the Communist leadership decided to found a new organ, the Hungarian Council of Science, designed to conduct all aspects of scholarship in the country.

The Council acted, in practice, like a formal ministry of science. It was, however, under direct Communist control: an organ of the Party executing administrative issues. Starting with Spring 1949, the Council of Science began to re-organize the overall structure of the historical discipline. First of all, many formerly established professors lost their positions or were forced to retire. The leadership of the Historical Society was replaced in March 1949. The new president, Erzsébet Andics, who in addition took over the edition of the traditionally most prestigious scholarly journal, *Századok* (Centuries), was one of the main Stalinist hard-liners, and dominated the discipline until 1956. The membership of the Society was selected to form a decisive Communist majority. Although non-Marxist historians of the older generations were also included, they were outnumbered by many young, sometimes rather talented, Marxist scholars. The crucial leading positions, nevertheless, were occupied by ideologically oriented Party bureaucrats.

The Academy of Sciences confirmed the membership of 102 persons of the altogether 260 old members. From 1949 onwards, higher education became part of centralized planning. All aspects of university and college life came to be directed by the Ministry of Education, existing under various names. The authorized Party centers determined the goals and financial means for these institutions. In 1950, special Departments of Marxism-Leninism were formed at all universities and 175 new textbooks were published, which were partly translations of Soviet works. Higher education was extensively formalized: standard

requirements were set up, which had to be respected in all institutions and by all professors.²

Although after 1956 the institutional system did not change significantly, several crucial figures of the Stalinist regime were removed and new ones, closer to the new leadership, were appointed. Apart from that, the faculties of certain universities were changed due to their involvement in the revolution, temporarily marginalizing a number of eminent scholars who could come back to the forefront of academic life from the mid-60s onwards.³ These changes notwithstanding, the institutional frames of scientific production remained the same throughout the whole period until the late 1970s and early 1980s. Apart from the universities, the major research centers were the newly-founded (1948) Historical Institute and the Institute for Party History. The most renowned journal was *Századok*, accompanied by *Történelmi Szemle* (Historical Review).

Throughout the entire period, the main focus of research remained modern—19th and 20th century—history. This peculiar attention also had ideological implications, since this era was considered the furnace of socialist revolution. The conceptual framework of interpretation preserved a conservative dual character: the historical process had to be explained in dialectic terms of antagonisms, like bourgeoisie vs. working classes, masters vs. people, or revolution vs. counter-revolution. The historical narratives, molded into a scenario with two “actors,” came to be loaded with a peculiarly tragic perspective. According to this scheme, throughout the course of Hungarian history, the progressive forces always suffered defeat, until the last and greatest catastrophe, World War II, when eventually Communists took power and ended the constant misfortune of the “good side.” The perspective of political history was suitable for interpreting the sources as traces of the struggle of two opposing forces, while this peculiar vision of the past could be personified through “politically conscious” constitutive figures.

The late 70s and early 80s were marked by two academic projects that were meant to reshape the canon of historiography. The first one was the edition of a ten-volume *History of Hungary* (actually, only nine were published), which brought together the elite of the profession in writing synthetic thematic essays on various aspects of a given period.⁴ The structure of the volumes did not remain untouched by

Marxism—that is, the propensity to always start from the socio-economic determinants and then to proceed to the political and cultural phenomena—, nor were the volumes always safe from contributions of uneven quality. In general, however, they were well-rooted in the positivist compromise of the time. The aim of the volumes was to give “thick” descriptions of the given periods, based on the most up-to-date research available, excluding, as much as possible, direct references to ideological meta-narratives, but also remaining rather restrained, keeping in mind potential alternative methodological perspectives.

The other synthesis was similar in structural terms, but it was ideologically much more loaded. Writing the history of Transylvania was considered to be out of the scope of Hungarian historiography in the 1950 and 60s, when the regime was trying hard not to offend the sensibilities of the fellow-Communist countries in the neighborhood. It became possible to publish such a book only when it became obvious to the Communist leadership that the Ceaușescu regime had launched an aggressive propaganda campaign abroad, publishing a series of booklets in Western languages and pushing the thesis that Hungarians were actually ungrateful newcomers in the flourishing land of the autochthonous Daco-Romanian population. Back in the mid-70s, György Ránki, the vice-director of the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, was already suggesting that the Institute would produce a synthetic work on Transylvania in the period of its next five-year work plan. The preparations of the book were quite protracted and the three-volume work was only published in 1985.⁵ It was a curious blend of some ‘classic’ tenets of inter-war Hungarian historiography (like the suggestion of the Lower-Danubian ethno-genesis of Romanians), some Marxist meta-historical models, a dose of historical self-criticism, and, most importantly, a positivist cult of factuality. The editor-in-chief was Béla Köpeczi, a renowned researcher of 18th century Transylvanian politics and literature, and—more conspicuously—also Minister of Culture at the time.⁶

The list of contributors to these collective volumes show that in the field of history there was no overwhelming political pre-selection, and the thematic chapters of these syntheses were usually written by the leading specialist of the given topic, no matter the provenance or ideological orientation of the person. In the 1980s, the institutional framework of research (most importantly the Institute of History of the Hun-

garian Academy of Sciences, directed by the social historian Zsigmond Pál Pach) brought together, in a syncretic co-existence, rather different people. Thus, within the framework of Hungarian historiography, doctrinaire Marxists, liberal Marxists, semi-dissenters, and anti-ideological neo-positivists were all present, and—of course, with a varying degree of institutional support—they could all publish their works regularly in the 70s and 80s.⁷

The scope of acceptable themes was also slowly but steadily expanding throughout the 70s and 80s, allowing contested figures to become the objects of biographical or monographic interest, such as István Bethlen (with Ignác Romsics' work on his early years),⁸ or Oszkár Jászi, whose radical democratic ideological heritage was recovered by Péter Hanák⁹ (1921–1997) and György Litván (1929–2006).¹⁰ The situation of 20th century topics was nevertheless somewhat precarious. It is characteristic of the period that the largest measure of repression was applied not against those authors that tackled some of the politically more ambivalent figures, but rather was aimed at a monograph on leader from the 1919 Soviet Republic of Hungary, Béla Kun. Due to pressure from the family and the Party leadership, Borsányi's book, published in 1979, was recalled from bookshops. It is symptomatic, however, that the copies were not destroyed. Rather, after some time, they were offered to the researchers who held an academic degree for purchase, with the devastating critique written by Dezső Nemes, a chief ideological guardian, attached to it.¹¹

The relaxation of the regime from the mid-80s brought a gradual transformation in terms of the growing concentration on “European” topics and contexts. Of course, this was not unprecedented, but was resurfacing from time to time from beneath the official historiographical production throughout the socialist period. In a way, it still came from the *Geistesgeschichte*-training of many of the historians of the older generations, for whom the documentation of the European context of Hungarian political and spiritual phenomena had a crucial place on the historical agenda. With the increasing participation of Hungarian scientific institutions in the European academic “joint ventures” and the emerging political program of harmonizing Hungary with the “Western” democracies, this direction was once again coming to the fore and shaped research projects which were previously at the margins of official cultural politics. This was the case of the work of Péter Hanák,

whose interest in turn-of-the-century Budapest everyday life and high culture was re-valORIZED in view of the growing respect for the common Austro-Hungarian heritage. By the 70s, this theme lost its original political overtones connected to the anti-Habsburg component of the national discourse and came to place Hungary in a symbolic neighborhood that was more “respectable” than the Eastern Bloc.

The late 1980s also produced an authoritative synthesis, exactly along the lines of this project of “Europeanization.” It was originally intended as a four-volume venture, but only three were published (authored by Pál Engel, Ferenc Szakály, and Domokos Kosáry). It is probably not by chance that it was exactly the ideologically most contestable period (from 1867 until present) that never appeared. Altogether, the volumes sought to provide an elegant narrative for students and the broader audience as well. At the same time, the authors integrated the most up-to-date results of historical research, problematizing the traditional conceptions in a radical way (e.g., Engel argued that in medieval Hungary there was no feudalism proper), and constantly referring to the European dimension of the problems.

The late 80s also brought the gradual reintegration—and eventual rehabilitation—of the most important historians of the 1930s and 40s, who had been excluded from the canon for political reasons. The critical reception of Gyula Szekfű started already in the late 70s,¹² and culminated in the re-edition of most of his works in the late 80s. The social historian István Hajnal was politically less problematic (as he never occupied any important public position in the inter-war period, and was also not completely inimical to Marxism as a historical method), but his historiographical voice also meant a challenge to official historical materialism. His works also had to wait until the 80s, when they suddenly burst into public consciousness as an oeuvre comparable and compatible with the *Annales*.¹³

The medievalists Péter Váczy and Elemér Mályusz were among the rare “survivors” from the 30s who still lived to see their rehabilitation, which also came at the turn of the decade. The most protracted and controversial process of rehabilitation was that of Bálint Hóman, not so much due to his scholarly output on medieval political and economic history, which was generally considered to be valuable, but rather due to his political involvement with the extreme right in the 1940s. As Minister of Culture in numerous governments in the 30s, he was quite

vocal even after the German occupation of the country, and was consequently summarily condemned to life imprisonment in 1945. His case evoked the strongest emotions both within the historical profession and outside of it, as the debate focused on the question whether professional and political activities can and should be separated when judging a historian's *oeuvre*. Along these lines, with the increasing search for international prestige and connections, some of the historians of the Hungarian diaspora began to be reintegrated into the local historical discourse, most importantly the political historian István Deák, the cultural historian John Lukacs, the medievalist János Bak, or the historian of 18th century and of historiography László Péter. The majority of their works were published, however, only in the early 90s.

The second half of the 80s posed a hitherto unthinkable challenge to historiography proper, as some topics, especially related to the preceding 50 years, evoked unprecedented interest and the demand could not be satisfied with works coming from the academic ateliers of the "guild." This specific *Glasnost* historiography was marked by the constantly changing boundaries of the pronounceable and consequently the need for quick production. This meant a methodological and thematic expansion (mainly towards historical sociology, political science, biography), involving previously uncommon approaches, such as oral history. The years immediately before 1989 were thus marked by a thrust of rediscovering previously suppressed topics, and giving a voice to the silent victims and bystanders of modern Hungarian history.¹⁴

2. THE NINETIES: THE CHANGING INFRASTRUCTURE

The principal drive behind institutional reformation after 1989 was the elementary demand for both collective and individual scholarly autonomy.¹⁵ Universities began to establish their independence both in terms of education and research. Similar to the other Eastern European cases, the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, which had been the center of research before 1989, became less visible after the transition, while the universities gained weight, at least in symbolic terms. This was partly due to the shift in financing (as the entire research sphere was seriously hit, while the universities were still considered necessary), but also to the introduction of Ph.D. programs, which were

assigned to the universities. At the same time, especially in the mid-90s, the economic restrictions hit the universities hard too—they were required to fire a substantial number of their teaching staff. This rationalization often meant that they got rid of those who did not have an established position or tenure, that is, the oldest teachers (who were made to retire) and the youngest. This led to the strengthening of the positions of the middle generation (around 40 or 45 at the time of the transition), who got hold of the departments, but also meant an almost complete blocking of new places for basically an entire decade.

The first doctoral programs in history were introduced in the academic year of 1995–96. At present, Ph.D. studies are conducted within ‘doctoral schools,’ organized according to thematic or chronological principles. With the concentration of young researchers and leading scholars within these doctoral schools, they have the potential of becoming catalysts of considerable professional achievement. However, the universities are often criticized for not integrating doctoral students sufficiently into collaborative research. According to these critiques, doctoral schools in many cases do not provide more than an “atomized” tutor–student relationship and it is dubious whether they will develop into genuine scientific workshops in the future. Although history students are interested in various other social sciences like sociology, cultural anthropology, economics, philosophy, and legal studies, undergraduate education is organized according to rigid disciplinary lines. Professors are collected within departments that reflect historical periodization and divided into ‘Hungarian’ and ‘Universal History’ sections.

Similar characteristics can be detected in the case of research institutes. The institution *par excellence* for historical scholarship is the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences. Apart from that, professionals of the discipline are involved in the work of the László Teleki Institute and the Minority Studies Institute, both of which concentrate on minority issues, primarily, but not exclusively, on Hungarians outside of the country. Given, however, the limited number of historians in the last two organizations (even though the directors of the institutions are historians themselves), they are not able to launch broad-scale research projects where the discipline could play a decisive role. In their initiatives, mostly dominated by political sociology or anthropology, history often fulfils a complementary function.

While a series of new higher education institutions were founded after 1989, in history the traditional ones (Budapest, Debrecen, Pécs, Szeged) managed to retain their symbolic prominence and infrastructural advantage. The only exception is probably Miskolc, where the pre-existing Technical University was extended to include a Faculty of Arts as well, and where the new recruitment at the History Department created some job opportunities for the generation of the “thirty-something,” who remained rather marginal in other universities. The two new denominational universities also made some efforts to lay the foundations of prestigious history departments, trying to attract more established professors from the state universities.

As for periodicals, there are numerous professional journals, including the oldest one, *Századok*, and the other traditional forum, *Történelmi Szemle*. The third significant periodical is *Aetas*, edited in Szeged. This journal emerged as a principal forum for theoretical and methodological reflections. Notwithstanding this, none of the journals possess easily recognizable distinctive features. All of them publish studies from more or less the same circle of authors, although *Aetas* also made important efforts to involve the younger generation.

Regarding methodological or theoretical orientation, all of them are fairly colorful, without a strong unifying paradigm. The more recently founded *Korall* is an exception in this respect, as it is exclusively dedicated to social history, attempting to establish an organ of the practitioners of this branch of research. Furthermore, history is a significant topic in other, not strictly disciplinary journals as well. The generally and broadly conceived intellectual public, including history teachers, however, mainly reads the popular journals *História*, edited by the Institute for History, and *Rubicon*, an independent periodical. The two popularizing magazines continue to have a certain impact, often finding a niche of targeting the most controversial issues for public historical consciousness, with sometimes even best-selling thematic issues (this was the case of the *Rubicon* issue on the life of János Kádár, which was even reprinted due to the unprecedented interest).

The structure of funding has been obviously transformed as well. While previously the sole financial source was the state, after 1989, with the appearance of local and foreign non-governmental organizations and foundations, as well as the establishment of new international institutional networks, the system was considerably diversified.

It is characteristic of the emerging plurality that, instead of producing one officially promoted synthesis of Hungarian history, the decade saw the proliferation of various individual and collective projects of narrating the history of Hungary in a concise manner. Varying both in quality and length, these works also aimed at different potential audiences, from local university students to the more or less informed foreign public. In Hungarian, the most successful venture was the series published by the Pannonica editing house, offering a separate volume for each century, written by specialists. The composition of the authors is characteristic of the craft in general: some of them can be identified as typical representatives of the post-Communist establishment while others come from younger generations.¹⁶ Therefore, the message of the series is also rather mixed. While some of the authors kept to some kind of unspoken post-Marxist model of explanation, others returned to a straightforward nationalist interpretation, while the younger contributors tended to distance themselves from the mainstream narratives of the 1970–80s, seeking to come up with a new framework. All in all, exactly in its somewhat mixed composition, the series can be considered the most representative reflection of the state of the art of Hungarian historiography in the late 1990s.

In foreign languages, the option of launching a book series comprising one book for each century would have been obviously overly ambitious. Instead, there was demand for relatively short and informative synthetic works, which could help the relatively uninformed readers orientate themselves in the complexities of Hungarian past. Responding to this challenge a number of works were published, obviously aiming at different audiences. The emigrant journalist Paul Lendvai's *The Hungarians* provides a belletristic narrative, aiming not so much at a scholarly audience but at the general public.¹⁷ The Switzerland-based literary critic Miklós Molnár, who left the country in 1956, offered a more scholarly narrative, synthesizing the mainstream historical discourse, using mainly the classics of Hungarian historiography as his source.¹⁸ The author of the third important synthesis, Budapest-based László Kontler, professor at Central European University, represents a younger generation than the other two authors. The most important feat of his volume is that he managed to bridge the conceptual and theoretical gap between the local production of historiography and the international scholarly community.¹⁹ He made enormous

efforts to integrate Hungarian historiographical terminology into the Anglo-American academic discourse, to look at the Hungarian “story” from a broader European perspective, and finally to make the results of the more recent research developments available in the West. In many ways, his narrative offered a more sceptical and analytical antidote to the post-romantic narratives of the emigrants, playing down the idiosyncratic elements of the local historiographical tradition and offering a “European” framework of interpretation.

3. SOCIAL HISTORY AS HISTOIRE TOTALE

At first sight, the most striking peculiarity of Hungarian historiography after 1989 is the renewed interest in the history of ‘society.’ In the atmosphere of the democratic transformation, it seemed that ‘social history’ possessed the potential of finally posing those relevant questions that the previous politically oriented scholarship was unable to formulate. It is worth considering that, in the 1990 issues of historical journals, social history already represented around one third of the publications, in spite of the still prevailing dominance of political history, which made up around one half of the articles.

This breakthrough of social history in the early 1990s was not a new-fangled phenomenon. In fact, the generation of young professionals that emerged during the 1980s turned towards the problems and methods of social history more and more favorably. Members of this group aspired to fill in those *lacunae* of historical knowledge that they had perceived during their student years a decade before. Their first urge and opportunity towards independent institutionalization came from economic history, which had successfully achieved disciplinary justification, and especially from György Ránki (1930–1988), who motivated the young scholars to deepen their understanding of social problems and guaranteed professional legitimacy within the broadly conceived field of economic history.

The second source of inspiration was Péter Hanák (1921–1997), who was among the path breakers in Hungary towards a social history of culture, or the amalgamation of cultural and social approaches to the past. Hanák was allowed to return to university teaching in 1980 and a significant part of his scholarly activity concerned professorial teaching duties as well as work as an editor.²⁰ The rising popularity

of social history in Hungarian late socialism was a result of the fact that its discourse provided a linguistic space in which controversial questions could be raised without direct reference to political power. The discursive approach of social history also allowed lip service to the basic principles of the Marxist—though not always partisan—historical vision (thinking in terms of the “laws” of historical process, the primacy of economic factors, and the pre-dominant constructive power of the political center), and also generated a form of representation that could become an important tool of deconstructing the late-socialist canon after 1989.

After the opening of debate in 1989, issues in social history provided a good opportunity to give empirical and scientific critique of the previously held scholarly views. This research culminated in the first social historical textbook in Hungary co-authored by leading scholars in the field, Gábor Gyáni and György Kövér, published in 1998. The work covers the formation of modern Hungarian society approximately between 1830 and 1945. The book was based on their historical sociology courses at the Institute of Sociology of ELTE University of Budapest. In addition to their pedagogical influence their publication was an essential part of social-historical discourse in the last decade in Hungary. Gyáni's contribution, the second part of the social history textbook, was, to a great extent, directed towards the critical re-assessment of the social history of the Horthy era.²¹

In his introduction, Gyáni argues that the previously applied Marxist concept of class is not appropriate for a meaningful interpretation of social structures and attitudes in the Horthy-era. First, he enumerates the theoretical revisions of the class-based historical analyses and demonstrates that classes are too heterogeneous to form well-defined interest groups. According to him, it was the orthodox Marxist vision that modelled the previous conceptions on the social history of the inter-war period. It was held that the ruling classes—an “alliance of great capitalists and landlords”—had faced the oppressed classes, i.e., workers and peasants, and forced the government to suppress all the aspirations of the lower classes by way of dictatorship. Contrary to this vision, Gyáni put forward his conception, according to which Hungarian society in the period had a more complex structure, irreducible to two antagonistic classes.²²

Precisely the methods of social history provided those empirical tools that were able to transform the picture of “two camps” into a more pluralistic image of the past. Gyáni, a well-trained social historian, chose to rely on statistical tables to drive home his message. The purpose of these references was to make the constitutive elements of the analysis available. The aim of these tables was thus to point at the parts of a “wholeness,” through detailed description of the categories. Statistical tables are, thus, also scientific tools providing access to aspects of a given entity and creating means of representation that depicts reality as polyphonic. Gyáni concentrates on the social structures in the textual parts as well: he meticulously describes the different social strata according to income, profession, mentality, and ethnicity.

Gyáni was almost the only middle-generation historian who put considerable energies into the methodological underpinning of his efforts. In a number of works he explored the main Western historiographical trends that emerged in the last decades. In his opinion, by undermining the epistemological basis of positivist factography, these new theoretical contributions pose an overall “post-modern” challenge to the traditional historiographical canon.²³ This challenge also puts into question the nation-centered narrative focus of the institutional mainstream production of historical knowledge, and opens up the possibility of “decentering” history, giving a voice to those actors whose presence was previously submerged by the national grand-narratives. At the same time, Gyáni rejected the radically relativistic implications of the post-modern approaches and reasserted that the historian’s task was searching for the “truth” with an ever refined toolkit of research—even though the historians are locked into their discursive setting, and the truths unearthed by them might not be possible to fit into an all-encompassing and unequivocal picture of the classical “*Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*.”

To sum up, researching the problems of ‘society’ and the application of ‘social history’ as a method of investigation and textual presentation provides a linguistic protocol that places the revision of the ideological, methodological, and empirical bases of the previously dominant historiography within the space of genuine scientific discourse. The cooperation of Gyáni and Kövér demonstrates well the tendencies and focuses of social historical thinking in Hungary. A third focal figure of the sub-discipline is the grand lady, Vera Bácskai, who, mainly with

her urban historical studies, influenced numerous students through her professorship in the doctoral school of the Department of Economic and Social History, Budapest.²⁴ The main schools of social history are traditionally in Budapest, at ELTE (Department of Economic and Social History, Department of Historical Sociology), and at the University of Debrecen, marked by scholars like Zsuzsa L. Nagy, who covered broad aspects of modern Hungarian history, from the intellectual history of liberal parties to the petit-bourgeoisie; István Rácz, who contributed to the understanding of early-modern agricultural structures; and Lajos Tímár, who is a distinguished expert in urban social history. Apart from the previous two centers, a strong social history school can be found at the University of Miskolc, where young researchers gathered around József Ö. Kovács.²⁵

The language and research methodology of social history evolved as an actual counter-discourse at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, based upon a set of conceptual presuppositions. Social history became a popular and proper critical weapon, since it was able to separate—and occasionally also isolate—the ‘social’ and ‘society’ from ‘political power’ and particularly the ‘state.’ Such a division rendered possible the symbolic rejection of political oppression and called attention to the sphere of independent ‘social’ activities. This specific conceptual contrast has a long tradition, featuring a fundamental intellectual assumption in Western political thought (ranging from Locke, who separated ‘civil society’ from the ‘government,’ to Hegel, who established a sharp distinction between ‘civil society’ and ‘state’).²⁶ Regularly, social thought considers power to be the asset of political or governmental elites, while society might accept or refuse political power, but is distinct from it in both cases. The only considerable attempt, perhaps, at the critical re-appraisal of this putative contrast came from Michel Foucault, who argued that power, especially its modern form, permeated society, formed its own small circles and no clear division could be revealed between society as a network of relationships and power as a chain of dependencies.

Notwithstanding the intellectual history of the juxtaposing of state and society, it had a specific Hungarian—or broadly speaking East-Central European—scientific context. Social history in general found an obvious source of scholarly inspiration in sociology. Social historians tend to borrow research methods and techniques of representa-

tion from sociological approaches. This was the case in Hungary, too, where historians also sought links to the contemporary sociological schools. In many ways, Hungarian sociological writings in the 1970s and 1980s constituted the most explicit and resolute critique of Communist political rule that could be articulated. Sociology achieved this precisely through a clear and sharp distinction between state and society. Describing social problems like poverty, inequality, and dysfunctional educational system, sociology condemned the power-holders for failing to help the social groups affected negatively by these processes. Thereby, on the one hand, society was depicted as being left to its own devices, on the other hand, while considering the illegal opportunities of success as spontaneous activity of society, it came to be defined in contrast to the state that obstructed successful social organization.

The latter becomes apparent in the case of Tibor Valuch's engaging social history textbook, which deals with the second half of the 20th century. Valuch's comprehensive volume concerns the structures of settlement, demography, stratification, habits, and mentality. The author, however, constructs the duality of power and society, defining power in terms of the claim to rule over the society, while society is seen as a locus of resistance driven by spontaneous processes. In this book, the connection between social history and sociology is very explicit. Contemporary sociological studies provided the most accessible sources to grasp 'society.' Valuch capitalizes on them as source material, thus borrowing their politically grounded critique of the state and power. In this sense, the title of the principal collective volume in social history of modern Hungary, "Power and Society in 20th-Century Hungarian History," edited by Valuch, is rather telling.²⁷

Social history, as formulated in the early 90s, aimed at the formation of a coherent discourse that would be able to replace politically oriented historiography with a more appropriate vision that still claimed to account for all possible aspects of the past. The principal works in this line not only sought to incorporate social stratification and structure within the range of social history, but also intended to encompass the economic aspects in terms of income conditions and structures of occupation. Political constituents are considered in terms of participation and dominance, voting behavior, or political stratification. The field of cultural history is incorporated into the history of civilization (the Hungarian term *művelődéstörténet* also implies educa-

tion) and is concerned with schooling, life-styles and conditions, housing and mentalities.

This program of “socio-cultural history” was realized in the most influential way by the late Károly Vörös (1926–1996), who was a distinguished social and urban historian at the Institute for History.²⁸ Research into urban life and urbanism was institutionalized as a sub-discipline of social history, which is, however, not a uniquely Hungarian phenomenon. Urban history had received a powerful justification within late Marxist historical scholarship, indirectly supporting the thesis of backward urbanization and the late arrival of modernity. That explained, at least for Marxist historians, the failure of capitalist modernization and legitimated the Communist turn. After 1989, however, urban history became a field of retrieving *bourgeois-citoyen* traditions—not entirely free from romantic idealization—and served as the principal means of constructing a historical discourse in opposition to the state.²⁹

In spite of the striking breakthrough of social history and its influence in the research of all historical periods, the approach was unable to create a representational form that could encompass all possible ways of understanding the past. The increasing variety of research done on non-mainstream problems formulated images on history that were difficult to fit into the universalistic concept of ‘society.’ Historical analysis from the perspective of gender meant a challenge. In Hungary Andrea Pető’s book on women in politics after 1945 was among the first gender history monographs. Pető’s original intention was to describe the history of one group in society, namely women, in a certain period. As she attempted to gather all the sources that concerned women, she encountered several peculiar stories that made the picture more colorful and vivid. These documents gave accounts of the romantic involvements of women who participated in the Communist movement. At first sight, love stories seem to be a logical completion to the general picture of gender roles in a society. However, the analysis of personal life narratives alters the representation of the past. These documents demonstrate the diffusion of politics into everyday private relations. Pető calls attention to the fact that in Communist love relationships the interests of the movement always enjoyed priority over private life. On the basis of this, the author points out the rigidity of emotional structures that prevented the genuine equality of women. Apart from

the original explanation of the failure of female emancipation, the book sheds new light on the formation of Communist dictatorship as well. Pető describes the way the officers' court of the police aimed at intervention and definition of sexual identities through the strict supervision of love relations. These narrations, however, relocated the explanation of the transformation after 1945 within the conceptual sphere of emotional structures and value systems.³⁰

In spite of the fact that the culturally interpreted concept of gender could inspire further research and innovative representations, in reality there is no corpus of gender history in Hungary. Although women studies grow in popularity especially among students, this interest did not develop into genuine gender-oriented scholarship. Scholarly interest in women produced traditional social history of women rather than new analyses of the past through the category of gender.³¹

The variety of historiography is to be understood not only in terms of research methodology or thematic orientation. Different historians construct various narratives with different sorts of actors, which are difficult to merge into one super-narrative. This diversification of historical representation blocked the expansion of the concept of 'society' and gave place to competing notions like culture, identity, and experience. It is not by accident that this phenomenon is observed with a certain aversion by the inner circle of the advocates of the social historical approach. While they are glad to see the increasing number of social historians, they also register the absence of genuine social history.

It is frequently claimed that there are no integrated research projects, the discipline is under-institutionalized and under-represented in education and in terms of professional reception.³² However, from the perspective of the diversification of the images of the past, the absence of wholly comprehensive collective research agendas appears to be the object of a nostalgic craving rather than a real shortcoming. This nostalgic sentiment evokes the heroic times of the *Annales*, when a new approach was able to integrate all historians who were discontent with the dominant political history. The *Annales* formulated a genuine paradigm, a universal vision of the past and a novel technique to represent it.³³ Due to its diversification, contemporary historical writing is unable to provide a perspective of that kind. The lack of a homogeneous method for accessing the past seems to be a disadvantage, however, only in view of history perceived as an integral whole, to be appropriated

through a careful and well-organized investigation of its constitutive parts. If history is conceived as a web of ramifying stories, occasionally overlapping but, at other times, extending into different dimensions, then this fragmentation is rather a merit than a failure.

4. IN SEARCH OF A NEW INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

In the last decades, one can list a series of important historical and literary *oeuvres* that contained some elements of intellectual history.³⁴ In the 90s many works were published, especially in the domain of literary studies, which sought to analyze certain historical problems from the perspective of intellectual history writ large (history of *topoi*, imagology, history of rhetoric, or the history of cultural transfer).³⁵ At the same time, the common frameworks of interpretation according to which the traditional history of ideas (literary or political) was written, proved to contain a series of methodological traps. This does not mean, of course, that all of those who tackled intellectual history were stepping necessarily into all of these traps: nevertheless, certain issues were rather persistently present in the classics of the genre from the 1950s to the 1980s.

The first trap was that of *periodization*: the temptation that certain intellectual outputs should be linked to some cultural grand narratives, without paying sufficient attention to their inherent questions (and thus becoming too deductive). In the history of Hungarian literary thought, there has been a series of debates in which the crucial question was whether a given author was a baroque or a mannerist thinker. Again, these studies abounded with such unproductive “meta-historical” constructions as the “early enlightenment,” which usually were meant to define certain thinkers as progressive. As a matter of fact, thinking in terms of these “immanent” periods is ultimately rooted in the tradition of *Geistesgeschichte*, which was extremely influential as a paradigm in the inter-war period, positing a series of “unavoidable” principles which were supposed to characterize a given period, determining all its manifestations. Interestingly, this perspective was also integrated into Marxist historical constructions, just accentuated by the corresponding normative marker (like “reactionary” Baroque, or “progressive” humanism).

The next problem was the “*concentration on great names*,” which is a typical characteristic of “small cultures”: this means that the authors construct their narrative in a way that the description of local devel-

opments or cultural networks is necessarily parallel to the constitutive elements of the European cultural canon. This is how a “Hungarian Machiavellism” was constructed from the scattered sceptical remarks on the nature of power. This was partly due to a permanent psychological urge of national self-documentation, and also to the influence of constructions like Meinecke’s, whose works marked the methodological mainstream in the 1920s but whose approach has come to be seriously questioned since then.

The following issue is related to the *history of receptions*. It remained unclear what can be and what cannot be studied by means of the history of receptions: in what sense can we speak, for example, of the dynamism of a context, what is the mechanism of the reception of a cultural tradition or conceptual framework? There are many one-sided works, which only document inherent references or external connections, leaving the internal dynamics of a tradition, or the complex interaction of internal and external structures, unexplained.

The next problem is that of *comparative analyses*. As there were no relevant comparative frameworks devised for the broader research of a topic, often irrelevant comparisons have been formulated, while even the basic knowledge of the more obviously comparable cases was missing. Thus, for example, Hungarian early-modern intellectual history has been traditionally practiced, with some notable exceptions, without any reference to the Czech, Polish, or Croatian contexts, and national romanticisms of the region were also often studied without any reference to the broader Eastern European regional context.

Last, but not least, there has been a *fragmentation* and *lack of communication* between the different methodological schools and canons: the narratives dealing with the same period from different perspectives—in view of literary, political, cultural, or even religious history—tended to thematize the very same problems in almost completely incompatible ways. The result was that certain *oeuvres*, marked by eminently political overtones, were studied only from the perspective of literature, and in some other cases historical interpretations ignored the narrative or poetical determinants of certain texts that they otherwise used as sources.

These problems become especially obvious if we look at the considerable transformations in the Western European mainstream practice of intellectual history. The real problem for a Hungarian intellectu-

al historian is no longer the question of whether it is possible or necessary to measure certain phenomena in Hungary along the main lines of the “Western canon”—as, in the meantime, the very structure of this canon has been also profoundly transformed. In the last decades, several *oeuvres* and intellectual traditions which were previously not considered to be part of this canon became a focus of academic attention. Examples are Lipsius and neo-stoicism, the ideologies of ancient constitutionalism, Harrington and the neo-Machiavellian discourse, the philosophical history of the Scottish Enlightenment, and social-Darwinism, etc. Thus, it is a pressing task to rewrite the Eastern European narratives that are traditionally anchored in history of reception and comparisons with Western contexts by reflecting on the problems highlighted by these Western methodological debates; that is, realizing that authorial intention, rhetorical framework, and the social and discursive position of the author might all be rather problematic points of reference. Ultimately we have to analyze all of these elements if we want to understand a text in the multiplicity of its referential systems.

Along these lines, in the last decade, there were some promising attempts in Hungarian historiography, undertaking the reception of recent “Western” methodological innovations and their application to local materials. Concerning the methodological canons of intellectual history, there were at least three markedly different directions of reception. The most prominent ones were the following: the so-called “Cambridge school,” German *Begriffsgeschichte* and *Diskursanalyse*, and the French post-structuralist thematization of discursivity. The methodological benefit of the “Cambridge school” was that it problematized the traditional perspective of the history of ideas, which focused on a few “great minds” of European culture, disregarding the specific context of the emergence of their ideas, as if they engaged in an eternal conversation. As for the reception of contextualist intellectual history in the 90s, it mostly appeared in works dealing with non-Hungarian topics and its high quality products in many ways remained outside of the mainstream of official historiography, probably also due to the institutional border-situation of “intellectual history” in between history and philosophy. The most important author in this vein is László Kontler, whose “The Mysteries of the State” used the methodological precepts of the “Cambridge school” to draw the picture of the origins of British conservatism. Later he turned to explore the German reception of

the Scottish Enlightenment.³⁶ From the younger generation, Ferenc Horkay Hörcher also made a pioneering effort in the popularization of the “Cambridge school,” by editing a selection of texts from Quentin Skinner, John Dunn, John G.A. Pocock, and Richard Tuck, followed by an eminently contextualist postscript, intended to explain the origins of contextualism to the Hungarian audience. The reception of English intellectual history was greatly facilitated by the work of the historian of philosophy Mária Ludassy,³⁷ who was probably the first person to apply modern British methodological and thematic frameworks in Hungary (studying the intellectual origins of liberalism and anti-liberalism mainly on French and English materials of the 17th through the 19th centuries), and whose exceptional irony and erudition was an inspiration for many generations dealing with the history of political ideas.

Conceptual history turns to the vocabularies of political interaction rather than to the authors of texts as the starting-point of analysis. A pioneering project of establishing a Hungarian *Begriffsgeschichte* was formulated by the philosopher György Bence (1941–2006) and the social historian Károly Halmos, who were keeping the program of analyzing political vocabularies alive throughout the 90s, although not producing any definitive collective result yet.³⁸ On the whole, the German input was not so popular among historians, but was rather strong in political science, and in certain cases it can be found in works that were edging on the intellectual history of political ideas (e.g., in the case of Márton Szabó)—but once again, the historical craft on the whole remained rather unimpressed by this development.

The situation is markedly different in the case of the French methodological input. French history-writing had a stronger infrastructure and a relatively weighty scientific lobby within the ranks of Hungarian historiography in the 60s and 70s, mainly due to the general acceptance of the *Annales* school as relatively compatible with historical materialism. Predictably, even though there were certain attempts to integrate Foucauldian and other perspectives into historiography, this francophile direction is mostly crystallized around the post-*Annales* school of social history, which makes the chances of an autonomous intellectual history rather limited.

All in all, the strongest paradigm in intellectual history to date remains a mixture of literary history and the history of ideas, along the lines laid down by the late Tibor Klaniczay (1923–1992), a crucial

figure of Hungarian literary studies from the 1950s onwards, with a certain sensitivity to reception aesthetics and theories of comparative literature. This direction also relies on the works of such literary historians as Lajos Csetri,³⁹ Ferenc Bíró,⁴⁰ or István Fenyő⁴¹ who have been analyzing themes pertaining to the history of ideas with painstaking philological care and with broad intellectual horizons. The followers of this trend, however, usually remain rather uninterested in the historical context, producing mostly imagological reconstructions, like that of the otherwise high-quality work of Sándor Óze.

In the 90s, there were some attempts, however, to apply the new methodological innovations of the *Begriffsgeschichte* or contextualism in actual research in the Hungarian context. One of the most important works along these lines is by Sándor Bene, who sought to extend his research of early-modern literary history towards a more encompassing framework of the history of political ideas.⁴² His *Theatrum Politicum* analyzed the concept of *public opinion* on 17th-century Hungarian and Italian materials and he also formulated a broad research agenda of intellectual history along these lines. In a similar vein, József Takáts analyzed early 19th-century Hungarian literary works in terms of the different discourses of collective identity,⁴³ while Gábor Gángó is engaged in a long-term research project of editing and reconsidering the *oeuvre* of József Eötvös from a contextualist perspective.⁴⁴ Parallel to these attempts, there is an emerging dialogue between the various scholars and schools dealing with the history of literature, political thought and mentalities, and parallel to literary and political intellectual history, there is an increasing interest on the part of political scientists in applying the—mainly German—approach of discourse analysis to Hungarian material.⁴⁵

Recently, another field has joined this emerging “contextualist” camp, namely art history. The exhibition at the National Gallery, entitled *History-Image*, made an extremely interesting attempt to document the reflection of Hungarian history in various artistic genres from the Middle Ages until the 20th century, presenting both the high cultural canon and also objects pertaining more to popular culture, seeking to decipher the different narratives of temporality encapsulated in the visual material.⁴⁶ This attempt, of course, was not without predecessors in art history proper, as, for example, the works of Géza Galavics concerning Baroque art were in the same direction, seeking to map

“visual discourses.”⁴⁷ The exhibition, however, applied this discursive analytical perspective on the *longue durée* of Hungarian art history, and even though the theoretical principles were not overemphasized, it turned out to be one of the most important, though somewhat exotic, attempts to apply (post-)modern methodologies of analyzing historical narrativity to the Hungarian material.

5. THE REVITALIZATION OF MEDIEVAL STUDIES

Regarding the relative success of social history in Hungary, it is not astonishing that many other branches made their first steps to renewal by adopting socially-oriented historical research. Thus, one could argue that the quest for autonomy in medieval studies began as a turn towards social history as well. Nonetheless, the breakthrough of medieval history conveyed a counter-ideological meaning in itself. Since the sub-discipline was often defined as a bourgeois nationalistic approach *par excellence*, medieval studies went through a considerable decline in the 1950–60s. The resurrection of an independent and powerful medieval studies signaled a return to pre-Communist Hungarian historiographical traditions, since the investigation of social problems in the Middle Ages was one of the leading fields of the scholarship before the Communist takeover.

It is, hence, not astonishing that as the social historians of more modern periods evoked István Hajnal (1892–1956), the key figure of the rapprochement between sociology and history in Hungary, medievalists turned towards the figures of Elemér Mályusz (1898–1989) and Sándor Domanovszky (1877–1955), thereby constructing a two-fold discontinuity: on the one hand, between the 1980s and the 1990s, on the other, in the years before and after 1945.⁴⁸ In this way, scholars reconstructed the Communist argument about discontinuity itself and sought to cover the otherwise fascinating continuity between late Marxist thought and the birth of the post-Marxist conceptions. In reality, the situation in medieval studies is very similar to that of social history in general: late socialist historiography, which maintained the relevance of certain ideologically crucial presumptions, created the language which later could be reversed to describe those thematic and methodological approaches that eventually ruined the validity of the previous set of presuppositions.

Discontinuity conceals itself precisely in the depth of this continuity: apparently identical descriptive language has very different political implications in different discursive contexts. In this regard, the reception of Jenő Szűcs's posthumously published book on late 13th century Hungarian history is extremely instructive. Szűcs (1928–1988), who came from a Calvinist cultural background, began his career during the 1950s, among many other talented young historians promoted by the regime. Later, however, he increasingly distanced himself from the Party. His monograph, published in 1993, was highly acclaimed as an example of high quality history entirely free of Marxist ideological ballasts.⁴⁹ Albeit it is true that the historian elided the concept of class struggle as the driving force of his narrative, he still attributed extraordinary role to certain components of the classical Marxist historical conception. In fact, Szűcs devotes one third of his book to the governance of King Béla IV, who reformed the economy, society, and politics of his country. The historian does not forget to mention that the king simply 'realized' the principles of his age: those from 'below' preserved their passive status, while social transformation was achieved by the active participants of the story: the king, and the political elite. At the same time, Szűcs also considers the 'state' to be the principal subject of history: in his account, the reconstruction and dissolution of central political institutions, which are usually identified with 'statehood,' are crucial tools of analysis. Thereby the fight for dominance over state organs becomes a crucial motive of history.

While Szűcs aims at understanding the social interests that lie behind political struggles; he also seeks to identify general laws of development. Thus, he identifies the principles of increasing feudal production in the growth of big secular estates. According to him, the longing for greater property led to the increase of power on the part of the great lords and, thereby, to the dissolution of central royal power. He deduces the origins of the backwardness of urban network in East-Central Europe from the very same dynamism. He contends that the powerful great landlords coerced the king to compromise and to hinder the development of urban communities. To sum up, by emphasizing the decisive role of politics, writing a history of the state, looking for the reasons of backwardness and general laws of development, Szűcs refined several crucial concepts of Marxian historical thought of his time. In many ways, the "étatist" tradition survived in

the medievalist school of Szeged University, characterized by the presence of historians like Gyula Kristó and Ferenc Makk. They concentrate mostly on problems of the 'organization of the state' through the translation of charters and the description of events in terms of state existence, focusing on high politics, diplomacy and central royal governance.⁵⁰

In turn, by producing a detailed analysis of social change and the structural transformation of feudal society, Szűcs and some other historians in the 1980s formulated a descriptive language that made it possible for subsequent generations of historians to follow different paths without any radical change. At the same time, after 1989, the main thematic orientation of the social history of the Middle Ages became the nobility instead of the peasantry or serfdom.⁵¹ The lowering of the scale is also a characteristic mark of these works: they do not aspire to construct the image of a national class or stratum empirically; they focus on a well-defined region or county as their research field.

In the 1990s, two dominant tendencies emerged. One of them, the representative figure of which was the late Pál Engel (1938–2001), aimed at a careful reconstruction of the nobility in its entirety. Here the limited area of research has a methodological justification: one can only learn about the reality of a social network through minute investigation. Therefore, Engel, in his path-breaking study on the nobility of Ung county, began with a detailed reconstruction of families and lineage. His purpose, however, was to learn about the fluctuation of property, that is, about land-ownership, which was the only objective determinant of social stratification. Then, the author looks for the origins of nobility and distinguishes various ways of rising into the nobility like immigration, the Church, and secular property, as well as the rise of former royal middlemen into the noble class through the 13th century. At last, Engel describes the structure of the nobility and asserts that it was a rather closed world, marked by a low level of mobility, despite the fact that he identified certain possible career itineraries.⁵²

Engel's work is similar to those French and British studies from the 1970s that attempted to describe the social texture of a given locality. Despite their success in narrowing the scale, these books shared the aims of classical social history, that is to say, to define a certain part of the entire society and to depict its role in view of the whole, or the connections of one constituent with the other parts. Engel also aimed

at a profound re-construction of the structure of the political elite of the Hungarian Kingdom in the 14th and 15th centuries. Although he called his research political history, he broadened his focus to include the mobility of office-holders, which marked a general social historical interest.⁵³

The other characteristic approach to medieval history has an even more pronounced micro-historical focus. Its central representative was the late Erik Fügedi (1916–1992), who—similarly to Engel—sought to reconstruct the structure of the nobility. However, instead of concentrating on a territorial unit, Fügedi chose to investigate the putative basic element of the noble class, the clan. The author hoped to accomplish this task by paying careful attention to a single clan, the Elefánthy. He described its structure through a gradual broadening of the context and presenting the different social surroundings. Fügedi began with the analysis of family relations in a strict sense, that is to say concentrating on the father and the mother. Then he mapped out the history of the clan's property as the basis of its autonomous noble status. One of the crucial means of handling land was the wide range of marriage strategies, which at the same time provided the primary manner of social networking.

The wider social environment was first of all the social stratum, the nobles of the neighborhood. Fügedi stated that the participation in the administration of the county took place through the basic network of relations for a noble clan. Fewer of its members managed to join the aristocracy, and only a few looked for service in the royal court. Fügedi's approach contradicted some of the main tenets of classical social history, emphasizing not the 'entirety,' from where the function of a particular item may be established, but turning to the specific local context to gain some knowledge of the whole. Therefore, he attempted to reconstruct the life experience of his actors in detail, trying to build the whole of social reality around his individual subjects.⁵⁴ Likewise, historical research of urbanism shifts its focus from the site of production towards the *loci* of autonomy, self-governance and common liberties.⁵⁵

A significant figure in the renewal of medieval studies in Hungary—as well as in broader Central and Eastern Europe—is János Bak, who returned to Budapest in the early 1990s to teach at ELTE and Central European University after a long exile in the West that began

in 1956. Bak played a considerable role in keeping the memory of the 1956 revolution alive; however his main scholarly interest remained the Middle Ages. His research activities are concentrated on two arrays of investigation: the analysis of medieval kingship and the social and cultural history of nobility. Bak is one of the leading members of the international research project *Nobility in Medieval and Early-modern Central Europe* (in addition to one that concerns the relationship of women and power in medieval Central and Eastern Europe). The problems of medieval kingship are relevant to Bak for analyzing the characteristics and techniques of power mechanism both in terms of symbolic and ritual rule and the organization and maintenance of the 'state.'⁵⁶

The next generation of medieval historians, however, formulated radically different views on history by capitalizing on the wide methodological opportunities of contemporary "Western" historiography. In these terms, Gábor Klaniczay's volume of studies, published in 1990, is a veritable milestone. Klaniczay's book has a well-defined thematic focus: popular culture. Although many of his studies concerned the whole of medieval culture and not only its 'lower' manifestations, eventually the core theme of the book is the issue of popular beliefs, perceived as anti-culture or a set of 'excluded' values. From this perspective, his work may be interpreted as an important contribution to the study of a segment of the social universe. Klaniczay's book, however, fosters different ambitions than the description of one distinct part of the social structure. While the author defines the mechanisms of exclusion and those alternative systems of values that perished during the process of civilization, he formulates a concept of history that is based upon the collective usage, construction, and appropriation of symbolic value-systems. Thereby, Klaniczay refuses to define a certain segment of the social structure through its cultural attributes, mentality, or values. Beliefs are not considered as signs that reflect one's place in the system, but rather as a thick texture that makes the traces of the past comprehensible.⁵⁷

The concept of culture and cultural studies provided a point of departure for new approaches in the study of medieval history. These studies focused mainly on the cult of saints in particular and religious life in general. This perspective helped authors to identify a culturally distinct period that was radically different from our modern present. Culture here is seen from an anthropological angle: the contingency of

the 'own world' is demonstrated through the 'strangeness' of the other. It is not accidental, therefore, that several of these interpretations were born on interdisciplinary grounds between the borders of history and ethnography.⁵⁸ Klaniczay's latest work itself was devoted to the comprehensive study of the cult of royal dynastic saints in Hungary. The author employs a comparative perspective ranging from Central and Eastern Europe to Western Europe in order to understand its transformations. The cult of royal saints was capitalized on through the re-vitalization of the sacral legitimacy of ruling dynasties; however during this process the cult transformed itself into a 'national mythology' taken on by the emerging noble middle-classes.⁵⁹

6. MENTALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES: EARLY-MODERN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY

In the case of early-modern historical studies, one can speak of a relatively unproblematic coexistence of the national "grand narrative" and methodological innovation and also of the successful fusion of intellectual history approaches with the various models of social history. This curious intertwining is due to the fact that many of the "modernist" historians of the post-1945 period (like Domokos Kosáry, Éva H. Balázs, Kálmán Benda) were working on early-modern topics and operated with a relatively flexible methodological model, seeking to relativize the one-sided "kuruc" (independentist) constructions by analyzing the social and administrative preconditions of the Habsburg rule, undermining most of the romantic excesses, yet retaining the main lines of the traditional historiographical construction.

After 1989, these historians became "canonized," and, contrary to the topics of later periods, the field was further depoliticized. For the inter-war historians, as well as for the above-mentioned "great generation," most of whom were personally connected to the inter-war schools, these questions were ideologically loaded. While the remnants of two alternative traditions were simultaneously present in the discursive space (a "pro-independence," "Protestant" construction vs. a pro-Habsburg, "Catholic" one), by the 90s, an almost complete discursive compromise was reached between them. At the same time, the collapse of traditional socio-political history somewhat undermined their classical constructions, creating a tangible methodological and the-

matic uneasiness, albeit rather unexpressed, among the middle-generation about some of the tenets of their predecessors. Thus, although the traditions of research in this time-slot were well-established and internationally successful, there was nevertheless a need to restructure the “horizons” of research. This was also due to a partial shift in the core group of scholars dealing with early-modern history. Some of the most important figures of the older and middle generation, like Kálmán Benda (1913–1994) and Ferenc Szakály (1942–1999), passed away. In fact, Szakály’s last work on the relationship of urbanization and Protestantism in the 16th and 17th centuries was one of the most important attempts, and probably a swan song, as it were, in the spirit of fusing social and cultural history, which was so typical of the 1970–80s.⁶⁰

The decade was marked by various attempts of reconsidering culture and society, and of experimenting with new methodologies. One of the most spectacular shifts along these lines was that of Ágnes R. Várkonyi, who had worked previously on 17th century cultural and political history, and also on the history of 19th century historiography. In the 90s, however, capitalizing on her previous research on military frontier zones, she launched an ambitious project of “ecological historical anthropology,” concentrating on the history of the non-human environment in the early-modern period.⁶¹ Another research project can also be referred back to the post-*Annales* methodological innovation, although it had its own “local” roots as well in the prestigious early-modern philology practiced at the University of Szeged. This project on early-modern Hungarian book collections, coordinated by István Monok, was to map not only the stocks of the provincial and noblemen libraries, but also to open up the research towards the history of mentalities of reading.⁶²

In many publications, the late György István Tóth (1956–2005) also turned to re-evaluate a type of document, traditionally used more for its factological value, to shed light on the broader socio-cultural conditions of early-modern Hungary from the perspective of the history of mentalities.⁶³ He published a series of articles analyzing reports of various representatives of the Catholic Church who visited Tripartite Hungary, turning the materials of ecclesiastical history into sources for the history of mentalities. He has also published a number of studies in similar vein on the sexuality of peasants, on the literacy of lower classes, and the social perception of temporality. This direction was also pres-

ent in the post-1989 works of Vera Zimányi⁶⁴ and Katalin Péter. The latter, in her studies on the history of childhood in early-modern Hungary, also made an obvious move towards historical anthropology.⁶⁵

A separate and highly prestigious branch of early-modernist historical research is Ottoman studies. From the 1970s onwards, a number of researchers—most importantly Pál Fodor, Géza Dávid, and Klára Hegyi—have been preoccupied with reconsidering the social and cultural situation of Hungary under the Turkish rule. Due to their radical shift of perspective away from the traditional historical canon—i.e., by looking at their research objects from the view-point of the Ottomans—they managed to re-thematize the relationship of Hungary to the Ottoman Empire, undermining many of the romantic commonplaces and accentuating the dynamic and complex relationships between the Hungarian political and social structures and the imperial framework.⁶⁶ It is along these lines that the younger generation of Ottomanist scholars, most prominently Gábor Ágoston, have been engaging themselves in researching Hungarian society under Turkish rule. It is due to the sophistication and international compatibility of the sub-field, which also went together with its relative separation from the mainstream of Hungarian historiography, that Ágoston, whose main interests lay in history of Ottoman administration, military, demography and Ottoman-European diplomatic relations, has been “jettisoned” out of the Hungarian educational system, and from the late 90s onwards has been teaching at Georgetown University.

There were attempts to abandon the self-centered Hungarian historical perspective from the “other side” as well, namely by historians who were dealing with the Habsburg context of Hungarian history in the 16th and 17th centuries. One can see this in the works of the younger generation, a representative of which is the military historian Géza Pálffy, one of the few younger historians who managed to reach a symbolic and institutional position in the 90s. Pálffy was invited to write the 17th century volume of the ambitious multi-volume synthesis organized by the Pannonica Publishing House.⁶⁷ Compared to the traditional narrative, Pálffy’s perspective is marked by a strong emphasis on the Habsburg state-framework and an evident distancing from the usual appreciative description of the Transylvanian principality as an alternative project seeking to retain the continuity of Hungarian statehood. Similarly, the work of Nóra Etényi, aiming at the analysis of pro-

paganda in the context of the Holy Roman Empire, helps to reconsider the role of the pamphlet news about Hungary, which the previous generations often took at face value.

While the 18th century was a central research topic for the previous generation, the 90s failed to produce anything like a coherent new paradigm. The most important figure of the middle-generation of historians concentrating on the political history of the late 18th century is János Poór. He is mostly interested in the reception of Enlightenment political ideas and the ideological conflicts of the Hungarian Estates and the Viennese Court.⁶⁸ In addition, a series of literary analyses have been published dealing with themes that pertained to a broadly defined cultural history. A case in point is the work of György Kókay,⁶⁹ whose studies on the history of the press of the late 18th century opened the way to a more complex reconstruction of the public sphere shaped by the interplay of ideas of the Enlightenment and the local cultural canons.

In fact, literary studies produced a number of contributions to our view of the 17th century as well. Probably the most interesting new input to early-modern studies has come from the borderlands of cultural and literary history (most importantly from Gábor Kecskeméti,⁷⁰ Ferenc Zemplényi,⁷¹ Emil Hargittay, Sándor Bene, and Pál Ács⁷²). A group of scholars, mostly working in the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences, turned to early-modern Hungarian literature from a perspective open to intellectual history and historical anthropology. They started to produce much more “contextualist” works on early-modern topics than the previous generations, thus creating a possibility of future dialogue between historians turning to the history of mentalities and of reading, and literary historians, turning to political discourses.

7. BETWEEN REVOLUTION AND COMPROMISE: POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Even though it was impossible to disentangle modern Hungarian national identity from the Reform Age and the 1848 Revolution, the Communist regime’s symbolic relationship to 1848–49 was not completely devoid of ambivalence. This attitude goes back to the very first years of the establishment of Stalinism in Hungary, when basi-

cally two alternative strategies were employed simultaneously. On the one hand, the regime, in a bombastic campaign orchestrated by József Révai, the principal cultural ideologue of the time, tried to establish a symbolic continuity, hailing some of the 1848 revolutionary leaders as quasi-Communists, identifying the projected Communist society with the fulfillment of the centuries-long freedom fights, and describing the Communists as the inheritors of the collective charisma of the national Pantheon, based eminently on the 19th century. On the other hand, some of the official historians of the regime, such as Erzsébet Andics or Erik Molnár, set out to re-evaluate the traditional historical canon in the spirit of class struggles and, as a result, proposed a narrative which would have purged Hungarian historiography of its “nationalist” overtones and, in some ways, returned to the work of the turn-of-the-century socialist scholar Ervin Szabó, who sought to destroy the liberal nationalist canon.

This duality remained visible after 1956 as well, the regime being undecided as to which direction to support. On the one hand, the exaltation of the national aspects of communism posed a danger of coming perniciously close to the ideological reservoir of the supporters of Imre Nagy. On the other hand, the Kádár regime sought to generate an image of breaking with Stalinist schematism and, for example, in the conspicuous silence of many writers after the defeated Revolution, the new leadership authorized the publication of works by many cultural figures—alive or dead—who were previously excluded from the canon for being nationalists. In addition, as the liberalization of the regime was taking shape from the early 60s onwards, trained historians who were marginalized in the 1950s could gradually come back. Once again, the plurality of discourses was unavoidable, as many of those historians were trained in the Protestant-independentist canon, while others were students of Szekfű, that is, moderate partisans of a Catholic pro-Habsburg narrative.

From the mid-1960s onwards, the Kádár-regime came to be considered a kind of *Ausgleich* by a wide segment of the intelligentsia, and this created a context for the reconsideration of 1867, too. In many ways, the school of social history emerging in the 60s, focusing on the modernization attempts in Hungary in the late 19th century, fit into this perspective—very much in line with the Western social history of the time, concentrating on world system theory, uneven territorial distribu-

tion of wealth, ‘sheltered modernization’ projects, etc. Giving up the political pretensions to independence, Hungarian society concentrated on its material well-being, and the supporters of the Socialist *embourgeoisement* of the 1960s and 70s could look back with sympathy to the rise of the bourgeoisie in *fin-de-siècle* Hungary. The picture of socioeconomic development in a peripheral society could be interpreted as an apology for the eternal realist drive of Hungarian politics—in the shadow of vast uncontrollable forces, trying to do ‘whatever could be done.’ This perspective was obviously permeating the liberal Kádárist version of social history that earned international prestige for György Ránki and Iván T. Berend, but it can even be found in politically more ambivalent cases, like that of Péter Hanák.

In some ways, the doyen of Hungarian historiography, the nonagenarian Domokos Kosáry also contributed to this narrative. A disciple of Szekfű in the late 30s, he was marginalized during the Stalinist period and could gradually come back in the 1960s and 70s. His historiographical perspective remained unaffected by Marxism and his research was based on the Rankean working hypothesis of the primacy of foreign politics and the interest in the international determinants of politics. Along these lines, his image of 19th-century Hungarian history, based on impressive primary research, was in many ways a reiteration of the conservative narrative of Hungarian history, pointing out the futility of “independentist day-dreaming” in the face of the geopolitical realities.⁷³

Although one cannot talk of a direct conflict, it is obvious that the historiographical “school” that emerged in the late 70s and 80s around György Szabad posed a challenge to this narrative. In some ways, the members of this school continued the discursive tradition of the Protestant-independentist historiographical narrative (important mediating links here were the Transylvanian-born Zsolt Trócsányi and the political historian István Barta), but they were also engaging in a project of reconsidering the Reform Age and the 1848 Revolution from a perspective of the emerging “bourgeois political culture.” New sources were involved and social, political, and intellectual history were combined in a way that went well beyond any Marxist model of historiography, thus effectively rehabilitating political history.

Due to the efforts of this cohort of scholars (featuring, among others, András Gergely, Gábor Erdődy, László Csorba, András Gerő, Iván Zoltán Dénes, Gábor Pajkossy, János Veliky and, to a certain extent,

an older historian, János Varga too), the first half of the 19th century is one of the research topics with the highest generational and discursive coherence. By the early 90s, they came to dominate the field of research on the “long” 19th century both institutionally and thematically. Nevertheless, while up to 1989 they seemed to be championing a unitary liberal nationalist vision, the transition process affected them in different ways and by now both their ranks and their meta-political narrative seem to be somewhat disintegrated due to different commitments like diplomatic service and political careers. Also, the immanent politicization of the 90s often pushed them to topics of greater contemporary relevance, even those members of the group who were not engaging in direct political activities. Nevertheless, their scholarly output in the last three decades bears the sign of a relatively cohesive historiographical vision. They succeeded in reshaping the myth of Kossuth and the Reform Age, while turning to critically reconsider many important aspects of the Hungarian liberal nationalist heritage. Their perspective determined the representative series edited to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the revolution, entitled *Hungarian Liberals*, which gave a selection of texts from each classic author, accompanied by a scholarly introduction.⁷⁴

The efforts of the “Szabad-school,” obviously not entirely devoid of topical political messages in the 70s and 80s, focused on the reconsideration of the traditional historiographical image of liberal nationalism in the Reform Age. They sought to interpret and contextualize the dilemmas of the Hungarian political nation in their own right, liberated from the ballast of inter-war anti-liberalism and the post-1945 overestimation of social determinants at the expense of the political sphere. They called attention to the peculiarities of the Hungarian parliamentary tradition, and ultimately sought to establish a symbolic continuity between modern democratic political ideas and the conceptions of the liberal nationalist political elite.

In the 90s, there emerged a series of possible directions this discourse could take. From the ranks of Szabad’s circle, András Gergely represented the liberal conservative option, serving in a diplomatic position under the conservative government of József Antall and trying to re-establish some kind of continuity between the liberal nationalist project of the 19th century and the subsequent variations of the moderate national(ist) discourse. Others, such as Gábor Erdődy and László

Csorba retained the dual character of the liberal nationalist discourse that characterized the 1970s and concentrated mainly on the protagonists of the Reform Age and the comparative European contexts of the Hungarian liberal movement. Erdődy, who also served as ambassador to Germany between 1992 and 1996, authored an important small monograph on German liberalism and another on the history of Hungarian political thought in 1848.⁷⁵ Csorba studied many elements of the Hungarian revolutionary emigration and the legal historical aspects of 19th-century Hungarian politics.⁷⁶

The intellectual historian Zoltán Iván Dénes, who before 1989 had worked on the Reform Age and the *oeuvre* of Gyula Szekfű, turned to the problems of collective identity and the dilemmas inherent in the inter-war debates about Hungarianness. He has written and edited a series of books focusing on the political philosophy and intellectual heritage of István Bibó, whom he considers a theoretical starting-point for a new synthesis of the values of political liberalism and communitarian solidarity.⁷⁷ This approach also inspired a group of researchers of the informal “Bibó Workshop” to link the study of the *oeuvre* of Bibó to broader issues in Hungarian intellectual history, transgressing the ahistoric use of Bibó as a political reference, which was characteristic of the early 1990s. These efforts led to a series of collective volumes. The more recent results of this cooperation are the intellectual biography of Bibó by Gábor Kovács,⁷⁸ an interpretation of Bibó’s theory of nationalism and anti-Semitism by Iván Balog,⁷⁹ and a collective volume on the contested historiographical image of Kossuth in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Representing yet another itinerary, the political historian András Gerő, whose main field of interest was Hungarian parliamentarism in the Dualist period, also assumed a more topical historiographical perspective. While continuing to publish on Hungarian politics between 1867 and 1918, he also dealt with the history of everyday life during Communism, urban culture, and the possibilities of liberal politics after 1989.⁸⁰ Gerő became the director of the Habsburg Institute, established with a huge state grant in 2002, representing a major symbolic investment into cultural politics by the Socialist-Liberal coalition government.

In the research into the 19th century, a unique methodological direction was represented by the late Mihály Lackó (1948–1997), who

also began his career with an analysis of the different conceptions of reforming Hungarian society and politics in the Reform Age. He, however, chose a perspective that differed from all previous descriptions, which focused mainly on political and institutional history. Lackó elaborated a psycho-historical approach in order to detect the character of certain historical actors and link their political views to their personalities. Unfortunately, before being able to finish his theoretically most promising and ambitious project, on the historico-psychological analysis of István Széchenyi, the historian died.⁸¹ In a similar vein, the work of Tibor Frank on the Habsburg secret agent, and later renowned British historian, Gustav Zerffi is also a skillful combination of political history and of an inquiry into the complex personality of the main hero.⁸²

In the 90s, one could witness the emergence of a younger generation of historians as well, with Ágnes Deák⁸³ and Gábor Gángó⁸⁴, who also research the 19th century. They rely more on an international perspective than the Szabad-school and pay more attention to the rethematization of the place of Hungary in the Habsburg "*Vielvölkerstaat*." Deák wrote the seminal volume on nationality politics in the 1850-60s in Hungary, while Gángó is doing research on Eötvös. Although working on different material, the military historian Róbert Hermann also sought to revise certain elements of the synthesis devised by the "Szabad-school," contributing an aspect that has been rather peripheral to the interests of the middle generation.⁸⁵ While they avoided any open clash with the previous generation, it is obvious that their reconstruction of the history of Hungary from the Reform Age up to the *Ausgleich* will be rather different than that of their predecessors.

8. SONDERWEG OR NATIONALIST MODERNIZATION? FROM THE TURN OF THE CENTURY TO 1945

Due to the relatively low level of the post-1989 academic output on the history of Communism, and also to the peculiar needs of symbolic legitimization on the part of various political camps, the inter-war period came to be the most contested era in Hungarian historiography. This is probably not so paradoxical, as previously it was this very period that was marked by a relatively strict enforced uniformity. While the 19th century was a battlefield of paradigms, the conflicts of interpretations regarding the 20th century were usually much more hidden. This

does not mean, however, that there were no clashes, but rather that the ideological implications of the research were stronger and, thus, the thematic range of acceptable topics and the “outcome” of the inquiries were much more predetermined. This is also true of the traditional “Socialist” themes, constitutive of the regime’s identity, such as 1919 or the workers’ movement. However, in certain cases even these could become rather problematic, as in the 1950s, when the memory of Béla Kun was systematically suppressed, mostly due to the fact that he perished in the Stalinist purges.

The 70s and 80s can be described as a period of re-thematization: more and more topics, previously treated schematically, were allowed to come to the fore. Among these topics were the revolution of 1918, the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire, and the underlying question of nationalities in the last decades of the Monarchy, which were treated in many monographs by József Galántai and Péter Sipos. More broadly, the Octobrist tradition was gradually becoming part of the tolerated field of research, first through the figure of Mihály Károlyi and the social-democrat Vilmos Böhm. The former, after the failure of the 1918 revolution, became a benevolent fellow-traveler of communism in his exile, nevertheless choosing another exile and resigning his ambassadorship to Paris as a protest to the Rajk-trial in 1949. The latter participated in the leadership of the Soviet Republic of Hungary in 1919, was active in the social democratic movement in the inter-war period, and chose emigration in 1949. Finally, even civic radicalism was reintegrated, though in the case of Oszkár Jászi this obviously did not entail his highly polemic works against communism, written in the 1930–40s. Political history between the two world wars was also becoming the object of creative research; most importantly Miklós Lackó, Gyula Juhász, and Mária Ormos contributed to a more nuanced, though politically unconflicting narrative about the Horthy regime.

In the late 80s, with the public sphere opening to alternative collective memories, the first half of the 20th century became the object of various attempts to re-thematize the traumas. More and more *oeuvres* were recovered in their entirety, like those of Szekfű or Jászi, and also new journals and new media started to contribute to the reshaping of historical consciousness. Among these magazines and journals were *Medvetánc* (originally the theoretical journal of the Communist Youth Organisation of the Faculty of Arts, gradually turning into one of the most important

forums of exchange of ideas on the suppressed past and the strategies of transition) and *Századvég* (initiated by a group of students, some of whom later became founders of FIDESZ, at this point championing an unusually broad spectrum of reference-figures traditionally divided into populists and urbanites, ranging from Jászi to Dezső Szabó).⁸⁶ Documentary films, which already had a high social prestige in the 70s, also contributed to this historical reconsideration and formed an alternative public sphere, where those statements that could not yet be made in an academic institution were formulated as subjective personal recollections. Thus, a whole range of projects were started, laying the foundations for archives of oral history as well as triggering further historical research on the most precarious moments of Hungarian history.⁸⁷

Not surprisingly, the relatively depoliticized nature of the historiography of the 20th century was challenged in the 1990s, as many political forces sought to re-establish some kind of continuity with the pre-1945 ideological and socio-cultural structures of the country. While almost every turning point came to be thematized in alternative ways, all in all, one can speak of the emergence of a post-nationalist official narrative, rediscovering, reconstructing, and extolling the symbolic heritages of István Tisza, István Bethlen, Kunó Klebelsberg, and Gyula Szekfű. They are taken to represent a canon of nationalist modernization, facilitated by state-protectionism towards the “historical classes” and “historical” high culture. This new canon is not only and not necessarily the creation of the nationalist camp, as it reflects a relatively broad *étatist* consensus, shared in its main lines by historians of rather different quality and character, such as Ferenc Glatz, Ignác Romsics, László Kósa, and László Tőkészki. Significantly, this narrative is not only and not so much a challenge to the Communist canon, but also to the (semi-)“dissenter” canon originating in the 1980s. It was elaborated, with different overtones, by Péter Hanák, György Litván, and, most importantly, Miklós Szabó (1935–2000), who all extolled the Hungarian “Octobrist” and civic radical tradition to counter both the traditional nationalist canon and the Communist narrative.⁸⁸

The most important work of this trend is Szabó’s study on the emergence of neo-conservatism and anti-liberalism in Hungary, which unfortunately came out only after his death.⁸⁹ Szabó’s research, spanning more than two decades, aimed at identifying the social and intellectual roots of right-wing radicalism in Hungary. In line with the international

research on the emergence of anti-liberalism in the Habsburg Monarchy, Szabó located the “paradigm shift” of conservatism in the 1880-1890s, signaled by the emergence of new political formations instrumentalizing the reservoir of mass politics, even though the Hungarian political system of the time was far from being participatory on a mass scale. Szabó also documented the vivid ideological exchange between the emerging Hungarian radical right-wing camp and their German counterparts. In general, Szabó’s intellectual landscape of *fin-de-siècle* Hungary pointed at the explosive potentials of the complex interplay of elements of modernity and the surviving premodern structures and mentalities.

Another crucial work coming from this generation is György Litván’s long-awaited biography of Oszkár Jászi.⁹⁰ Drawing on the previously unpublished personal archive of Jászi in the United States, Litván followed the personal and intellectual itinerary of his hero with painstaking care. As a result, while the momentum of Litván’s previous works on Jászi, searching for a left-wing ideological alternative to Communism, waned, the reader receives a vivid portrait, not uncritical of Jászi’s behavior but all in all asserting his symbolic position as one of the most important Hungarian democratic thinkers and politicians in the 20th century. Significantly, the image of Jászi did not remain uncontested. Thus, for instance, the intellectual biography by János Pelle, who explicitly identified himself with the political discourse of the right-wing government between 1998 and 2002, sought to reshape radically the image of Jászi, describing him as a failed politician torn by his ambiguous relationship to his own Jewishness.⁹¹

It would be farfetched, though, to claim that the historiographical image of the 1910–20s became the focus of political debate. Besides these visible ideological cleavages, there is a relatively non-ideological, neo-positivist body of research on inter-war political culture as well, analyzing the structure of the party-system, mass organizations, social politics, etc. Some works, primarily biographies have been historiographical bestsellers, while other, more specialized topics remained completely outside of the public sphere.

In the last decade, a considerable number of popular historiographical works have been published, often by historians who were faithful servants of the official historiography under Communism—seeking to forge a new narrative, which would somehow create a normative past for the emerging political order. In the search for “usable pasts,” they

sought to refute the allegation that the most obvious continuity of the new regime was, if anything, with late-Kádárism. The attempt to bring back the referential system of the 30s also led to the publication of new sources and selected editions of some of the cultural-political figures of the period. Luckily enough, many of these editions were done in an eminently scholarly way, reflecting—though not necessarily pointing to—the ambivalence of the discourses of the given figure. Such editions focused on, for example, the heritage of Count Kunó Klebelsberg, the most important cultural politician of the 20s. He was reintroduced into public discourse by Ferenc Glatz, historian, minister of culture in the last Communist government, and President of the Academy of Sciences throughout the 90s, who obviously found a role model in the vigorous organizational activities and conservative reformism of Klebelsberg. Similar projects took up Pál Teleki, eminent geographer, prime minister in 1939–41, and symbolic figure of the ethno-political reformism of the inter-war period, or István Tisza, prime minister in the 1910s whose economic liberalism was coupled with an intolerant stance both to the nationalities and the left-wing political opposition.

In terms of more synthetic narratives, it is not surprising that exactly those texts that tried to remain uninhibited by this pressure of political topicality, and sought more critical stance towards their object (even though their interests and choice of topics were doubtlessly influenced by the political atmosphere of the day) seem to be the most valuable historiographic works. Probably the most influential works concerning the period were written by two political historians, Mária Ormos and Ignác Romsics. Ormos, professor at the University of Pécs, who has been a respected scholar of fascism from the 70s onwards, kept publishing her bestseller-biographies on dictators.⁹² The real *tour de force*, however, was her monograph on Miklós Kozma, a close collaborator of Horthy, who was responsible for the propaganda and public image of the regime, and who, in the second part of the 30s, made some steps to involve the young generation of reformists, preparing a kind of “cultural and political opening” in face of the Nazi danger.⁹³

In the figure of Kozma Ormos found a symbol of the ambivalence of Hungarian conservative reformism. Kozma, member of the new elite that came to power with the counter-revolution of 1919, indeed made a spectacular career. Beginning as a hussar-captain he emerged as a successful entrepreneur, director of the Hungarian News Agen-

cy, minister of interior in the mid-30s, and, finally, governor of the re-annexed Carpatho-Ukrainian territories. Using Kozma's personal papers, Ormos paints an engaging and also tragic picture of her hero, who, in his various social roles, was constantly trapped by the irresolvable contradictions inherent in his moral and political commitments. He believed in the power of telling the truth and saw the future of Hungary conditioned upon accepting the "smallness" of the nation; at the same time, he was supposed to co-ordinate the revisionist propaganda machine of the country. He was asked by his ex-comrade in the counter-revolutionary fight, Gyula Gömbös, to work in the government that sought to connect social reformism with the introduction of a semi-totalitarian one-party system, while at the same time he increasingly distanced himself from totalitarian ideologies and saw Hungary's survival in keeping a considerable distance from Germany. He was committed to governing the regained territories in the spirit of justice and equity, but one of the first measures he came to implement was the expulsion of displaced Jews from Carpatho-Ukraine, who were then massacred by the Germans. At the end of his life, he completely collapsed and in his diary frequently meditated on the tragic incoherence of his life.

Perhaps it was Ignác Romsics whose perspective was the most influential in the reconsideration of the inter-war period. As mentioned before, his first important monograph was on the early career of István Bethlen. In the 90s, he published a series of monographs and edited volumes, which sought to reshape the political history of the first half of the century. His narrative is a somewhat odd but productive blend of modernist methodology and politically moderate neo-conservatism. In many ways, he returned to the tenets and issues of the historiography of the 30s, like the question of the Trianon treaty, and tackled these problems from the classical methodological perspective, combining the history of diplomacy and geo-politics. At the same time, these analyses were integrated into a broader framework, which was comprised of contemporary theoretical references elaborated by nationalism studies. The traditional topics connected to the traumatic historical events gained new meaning and were fit into the perspective of the protracted *longue durée* of Hungarian nation-building. Therefore, while thematically he often evokes the self-victimizing core of the inter-war historical narrative, Romsics ultimately contributed to the relativization of these

tenets and effectively tones down the traditional claims of Hungarian exceptionalism.⁹⁴

While seeking to adjust Hungarian historical consciousness to the new challenges, Romsics has also turned to the concept of “myth,” which became a keyword in a number of historiographical debates in post-Communist Eastern Europe.⁹⁵ Concentrating on the inter-war period, he edited a volume with contributions by a younger generation of historians, often his former students, reconsidering some of the popular historical myths prevalent in Hungarian private and public discourse.⁹⁶

Complementing these efforts, the diplomatic historian András D. Bán has published a series of important documents concerning the broader context and limitations of Hungary’s foreign policy in the period, pointing out both the hitherto invisible zones of maneuver, the failed opportunities, and also the uncontrollable and external factors that determined the movement of Hungarian diplomacy, especially during World War II.⁹⁷ Another contribution to the understanding of Hungarian politics is the painstaking research by József Vonyó into the political structure of the Hungarian extreme right-wing mass movements of the 30s. Vonyó’s research also aims at the relativization of the existing summary definitions of fascism and seeks to create a more nuanced analytical framework for describing the relevant political configurations.⁹⁸

There was a noticeable popular demand for books reshaping the image of the World War and rendering the complexity of the events tangible for the readership. One of the most successful monographs of the late 1990s, Krisztián Ungváry’s work on the siege of Budapest in 1944–45 aimed at a more differentiated image of the World War, bringing together military “macrohistory” with the personal recollections of the military and civil participants of the events.⁹⁹ The success of the book was indicative of the re-orientation of the historical ‘market.’ While political history was at the focus of interests, intellectual history, which would require even more interpretative distance, was rather marginalized in the discussions on the inter-war period.

Probably the most important exception is the veteran Miklós Lackó, whose significant pre-1989 *oeuvre* was supplemented with a series of publications exhibiting his hermeneutic skills. Lackó also came from a Marxist background, and his first important publications back in the

60s dealt with the roots of extreme right-wing political movements from a “historical materialist” perspective. Gradually, however, he moved to a much more context-sensitive approach and with meticulous work he recovered a series of intellectual heritages and cultural debates of the 20s and 30s. By the 80s, his status as the most important intellectual historian of the inter-war period was incontestable, the subject of his studies ranging from populism to civic radicalism, from the extreme right to socialism. In the 90s, he continued his work of contextualizing the cultural debates of the inter-war period and was probably the most balanced interpreter of the “populist–urbanite” debate, which came to evoke new passions in certain circles of the intelligentsia. Searching for cultural models in an atmosphere of revived ethno-politics and efforts to create a cultural-political continuity with the 30s, Lackó proposed an alternative canon. He turned back to the liberal-conservative humanism of some cultural figures of the 30s, such as the *Geistesgeschichte*-oriented philosopher Lajos Prohászka, the art historian Lajos Fülep, or the classical philologist Károly Kerényi, who were deeply concerned with the crisis of European culture, but instead of turning to a totalitarian solution that promised collective regeneration, they asserted the values of the classical European heritage.

In general, the rediscovery of this conservative-liberal orientation was probably the most important novelty of Hungarian intellectual history concerning the inter-war period. Apart from Lackó, the versatile historian, Ambrus Miskolczy, also contributed to this reorientation, analyzing the intertwining aesthetic and (meta-)political agendas of inter-war conservative-liberalism, searching for an escape from the pressure of left- and right-wing totalitarianisms. Simultaneously, a reconsideration of the inter-war historiographical tradition also produced a complicated picture of ideological affinities and enmities. The research mainly aimed at the work of István Hajnal, Gyula Szekfű, and Elemér Mályusz, who all had enormous impact in their lifetimes and who could be considered the precursors of various historiographical trends that became dominant in the 1990s.¹⁰⁰

Alongside with these careful interpretations, the late 90s also witnessed the emergence of a much more radical project of rewriting the historical consciousness of society. While some attempts were already made during the first conservative government between 1990 and 1994,¹⁰¹ these were markedly less powerful, due to the general lack of

resources and the considerable chaos following the transition. These attempts were revived by the political elite around FIDESZ, in government between 1998 and 2002, shifting from radical liberalism to neo-conservatism, and having at its disposal a considerably stronger economic and bureaucratic basis.

The political project of this “new right” was tellingly formulated in the electoral slogan—“less than a change of regime, more than a change of government.” After coming to power, the governing party and its intellectual entourage made an attempt to coin a new historical narrative, presenting Hungarian history as a general success-story occasionally interrupted by tragic events, which were always intrusions from “outside,” such as Trianon. This “new history” was meant to underpin national pride, which was allegedly ruined under Communism. The “official” re-evaluation did not entail a complete subversion of symbols and references and was coupled by a fair dose of ahistoricism. The rekindled cult of the “Golden Team” of the 50s could go together with the vocal repudiation of Stalinism. An historical film about Széchenyi could end with a fictitious murder case just because the main actor, a devout Catholic and friend of the Prime Minister, decided that Széchenyi, another devout Catholic, could not have possibly committed suicide. Nevertheless, this effort was marked by a certain discursive coherence in terms of rewriting the past. While the chief ideologist of the FIDESZ government in the historical field, Mária Schmidt, dealt with the post-1945 period (though her original field of research was the Holocaust),¹⁰² some of the others, like László Tőkéczi, were also experimenting with a neo-nationalist narrative about the first half of the century, usually promoting the figure of István Tisza as a model of a politician bringing together economic modernism and political nationalism.

Usually detached from political topicality, those practitioners of cultural history (especially those in the sense of *művelődéstörténet*, which denotes *Kulturgeschichte* in the traditional sense rather than Anglo-American “cultural history”) who were dealing with the inter-war period usually moved towards conservatism.¹⁰³ They hewed to a positivist line, usually not referring to modern Western methodological canons pertaining to their field, such as cultural studies, semiotics, and historical anthropology. The focus of their research, instead, concerned denominational history, and the history of civic associations.

Social historians dealing with the period were not completely untouched by these cultural history projects, as some of the older professors (such as Vera Bácskai) were an inspiration for both of the branches. The voice of Gábor Gyáni and the circle around him is nevertheless markedly different from cultural history as practiced in Hungary, most importantly due to their constant stress on the reception of Western methodologies and the globalized nature not only of their methodological references, but also of the questions they pose and the channels of their scholarly communication. It is no wonder, then, that in the 90s, it was exactly this methodological direction, besides that of Romsics, which proved to be the most attractive for the younger generation of historians. These two circles functioned as informal “schools” of the historical research of the 20th century.

9. JEWISH HISTORY AND THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DEBATES ON ANTI-SEMITISM

The historical research on anti-Semitism became one of the most contested and vivid fields of social research in Hungary after 1989. After the collapse of Communism, it seemed to be possible to negotiate the issue openly again. The excitement of this topic was naturally increased by the long years of silence. At the same time, the phenomenon ceased to remain a topic of purely intellectual discussion: it often involved direct political considerations. This was fostered by many factors, like the post-1989 rediscovery and re-creation of Jewish identities, the emergence of ethnic nationalism, the attempts to “regenerate” national identity after the alleged denationalization of the socialist period, and the open appearance of right-wing radicalism. The increasing historical interest was accompanied by intense research within the fields of social psychology and the sociology of collective mentalities. As a matter of fact, historical scholarship turned again to the issue from the late 1980s onwards.¹⁰⁴ At the time, however, the debates were conducted on an abstract level, within the general framework of the belated Hungarian modernization.

The historiography of the 1990s was conditioned by the practical and pressing need to explore the causes of anti-Semitic aggression. The variety of research agendas catalyzed very diverse scholarly approaches. Thus, research on the Hungarian Holocaust was enlivened both in

Hungary and in Western academic institutions.¹⁰⁵ Studies on specific topics, like the fate of the Budapest ghetto, the deportation of countryside Jews, the economic deprivation of Hungarian Jews and the fate of their assets as well as the role of Hungarian authorities in the extermination were published.¹⁰⁶ As a result of these particular investigations, a series of comprehensive monographs appeared.¹⁰⁷ One of the main features of the new research is that it attempts to understand the causes of violence through the analysis of state policies, investigating political actions like propaganda, practice of the laws, and the attitude of certain political actors or parties towards anti-Semitism or Jews in general. The increasing interest in anti-Semitism contributed to broader social-historical analyses. These new works look for the social roots of anti-Jewish sentiments, which they often localize in anti-Semitic politics. These studies identify the social segregation and exclusion of Jews with hostile political rhetoric or legal regulation, thereby focus mostly on the political sphere of prejudice and aversion.¹⁰⁸

It is, thus, hardly accidental that the two mostly debated books concerning the issue of anti-Semitism deal with the causes of popular anti-Jewish emotions. Both the work of János Pelle, who devoted his study to the pogroms that followed World War II, and that of Tamás Kende, who developed his argument on the basis of earlier—18th and 19th century—cases, tried to explain peasant violence towards Jews.¹⁰⁹ Pelle describes the genesis of popular anti-Semitism through a peculiar psychoanalytic reasoning. He attributes it to ‘diseases of the mind’ that came from ancient prejudices and fears of the Devil, whom Christians identified with the symbolic figure of the Jew. In his contention, prejudice was maintained by the extensive anti-Semitic propaganda during the late 19th and early 20th centuries and came to the fore again due to the general misery after 1945. In spite of the satisfactory number of causes for ‘anti-Semitism from below,’ he insists on trying to prove—unsuccessfully, due to the absence of records or other type of evidence—that the outbreak of actual pogroms was the result of direct political organization. Therefore, Pelle de-mystifies and mystifies at the same time the concept of the ‘people.’¹¹⁰

Tamás Kende’s intention is to break with the tradition of political history that searches for traces of conscious organization and conspiracies. Instead the author looks for the roots of anti-Semitic aggression in different social and cultural elements, like an allegedly anthropologi-

cally universal bias against strangers and the occasionally increasing social tension that emerges when a community is forced to deal with the 'stranger' in extraordinary situations. Later, the author brings in another element that attempts to activate the previously described passive popular knowledge. Kende identifies an active organizer in each of the cases he analyzed, who, due to his or her status as an intellectual, was able to transfer popular aversion into the sphere of politics. These persons, however, did not arrive with the politically conscious intention to organize pogroms, but rather formulated the popular aversion in the language of high culture, acting as mediators between 'high' and 'low' culture. In this way, however, popular beliefs and behavior appear to be unchangeable. Change and, thus, history comes with the figure of the intellectual—the representative of high culture.¹¹¹

Of course, historical research did not exclusively accentuate conflictual aspects of Hungarian-Jewish coexistence. Géza Komoróczy, who, in another role, is the major Hungarian scholar of ancient Near East, edited, a multi-volume project, provocatively entitled "Jewish Budapest"—subverting the traditional anti-Semitic labeling of Budapest as being "contaminated" by the Jews.¹¹² The book offered a kind of *lieux de mémoire* for the cultural flourishing that marked the Jewish *embourgeoisement* process in the Hungarian capital, especially at the turn of the century. Komoróczy is also the author of a "meta-historical" narrative focusing on collective identity.¹¹³ The book sought to thematize the alternative codes of collective identity-discourse in the early 90s, in a way reading "synoptically" the identity-discourses and conflicts of the post-1989 intelligentsia into the material of the Biblical times, describing Jeremiah as a "critical intellectual" and Eliyah as a "fundamentalist." The essays, written with tongue-in-cheek playfulness and immense cultural erudition, turned out to be a meditation on the normativity of national tradition, the alternative canons of narrative identity, and the force of collective memory. Its unconventional handling of historical material catalyzed a debate on the limits of historical narrativity and the desirability of a "postmodern turn" in Hungarian historiography.

The attention of the historians was usually centered on more "down-to-earth" issues, however, clashing over possible interpretations and not on the possibility of interpretation. An important turn in the argument on Jewish history was initiated by the Paris- and Budapest-

based historical sociologist, Viktor Karády. His book, *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció*,¹¹⁴ uses the methods of historical sociology like statistics, series of data, and quantitative analysis to understand the process of the adjustment of Hungarian Jewry to the constantly changing social environment of modern Hungary. The historian investigates the structure of social reproduction through educational preferences and employment in order to describe the generally successful strategies of Jewish middle classes in meeting the challenges of economic and cultural modernization. He also recognizes the bases of the corporate identity of the Jewish community in these common experiences. At the same time, he does not forget to emphasize the relevance of the pressure of the surrounding majority society.¹¹⁵

The debate around the book was only partly related to the direct causes of anti-Semitism. It was, to a greater extent, concerned with the contested theories of modernization and Hungarian social development. Karády asserts that the Jewish community in Hungary was conspicuously more successful in engaging with market economy and capitalist business practices due to its original material and intellectual capital such as education and experience in trade. Apart from the problem that Karády's argument could be read as unintendedly supporting the core of the anti-capitalistic variant of anti-Semitic argumentation, the book was fiercely criticized by Gábor Gyáni for failing to provide satisfactory empirical evidence for his claims. Gyáni pointed out that the image of the skillful Jewish bourgeois who overcame the slow and provincial Hungarian gentry in the modernization contest cannot withstand an empirical test. The social historian asserted that, on the one hand, other groups apart from the Jewish middle class participated enthusiastically and successfully in the process of *embourgeoisement* and, on the other hand, the dynamic modernization marked only one well-defined group of the Jews, namely the city-dweller, flexible *neologue* community. All in all, Gyáni blamed Karády for uncritically resurrecting the idea of the 'double structure' of Hungarian society that was coined by certain populist ideologues, most importantly Ferenc Erdei, before 1945.¹¹⁶

It is obvious that the stake of the debate was the formulation of a new model of Hungarian modernization. In Gyáni's reading, this process mobilized very different layers of the Hungarian society—from the country gentry to the Jewish urban intelligentsia. In order to support

his argument, he evoked a series of 'subjective' manifestations, like personal diaries, in order to detect the traces of a putative 'bourgeois mentality' and to measure the level of *embourgeoisement* in certain social groups. As a matter of fact, the two projects are rooted in two possible 'grand narratives' about Hungarian modernity. Karády was registering the breathtaking speed of assimilation and cultural integration of the urban Jewry at the turn of the century and suggested that the overall modernity-deficit of the society was mainly responsible for the increasing frustration and eventual conflict of this new middle class and the traditional elite-groups. Gyáni's narrative was less determined by the subsequent tragedy and put the emphasis on the concept of 'civilization' as a possible core of identity for the entire modern Hungarian society.¹¹⁷

10. THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL IMAGE OF THE COMMUNIST PERIOD

At first sight, this thematic sub-discipline exhibits quite striking features of discontinuity. Obviously, what the Party pronounced about its own history began to be fiercely criticized and empirically revised. Understandably enough, subverting the tenets of Communist historiography turned into a task of eminent importance. In the first moments of "liberty," the most appropriate mode of coming to terms with the past scholarship seemed to be to prove that it had been complete fakery. Given this it is not accidental that the first transitory years featured a peculiar juridico-historical process of collecting and publishing the records of the Communist jurisdiction.¹¹⁸ The duty to allow the public access to the previously hidden mechanisms of decision making provided the historians with the immense task of editing and publishing vast collections of Party documents and other related material. This work will surely continue to guarantee the profession occupation for many years further on.¹¹⁹

After the first period of enthusiasm, it began to be admitted, however, that Communist historiography had been based upon "false principles" rather than on factual falsifications. The most important dogma of the regime was encapsulated in the statement that the uprising in October 1956 had been a 'counter-revolution.' Democratic political identity after 1989 in Hungary was, to a large extent, grounded on the memory of the anti-Stalinist revolution. Therefore, professional research into its

history was ranked among the most urgent scientific duties. The government established a new research institute whose work was devoted exclusively to the details of the 1956 events. The institute quickly published a general textbook and a bibliography. It also began to issue a yearbook series.¹²⁰ The researchers affiliated with the institute produced a series of synthetic works, in both Hungarian and English. In addition, the study of 1956 takes place outside the walls of the institute as well, mainly at university departments.

Naturally enough, the historiographical image of 1956 is hotly contested. The center of the debate, with an obvious contemporary political import, is about the extent to which it was catalyzed by “reform Communists” and the extent to which it was anti-Communist revolt. While there are alternative views on this matter, formulated by rival professional sub-cultures, the real gap is between historical science proper—mostly concentrating on the history of the political leadership of the revolution—and the rank and file of the “1956-er” organizations, which came to be dominated by the right-wing political networks. On the surface, their discontent can be explained with the fact that they would like to see their own genealogy projected into the “official” historical narratives. However, the conflict also embodies a broader—epistemological—cleavage between the variety of the “subjective” perspectives of the historical actors and the approach of mainstream historiography, which focuses on the macro-level and the microhistory of elites.¹²¹ Whereas the re-appraisal of 1956 had long been a task of historiography, research into the organs of repression also became important. The mysterious and mythical organizations came to the light as object of rigorous scientific investigation and were used as keys to understand, although from very different perspectives, the Communist system in general.¹²²

In spite of the undeniable thematic rupture, a powerful continuity also exists between the scholarship of the 1980s and 1990s, as the sub-discipline has failed to formulate an independent conceptual structure until now. Historians speak the same language used by their predecessors—the language of politics. The object of description and the subject of narratives is most often the Communist Party.¹²³ The fact that what the Party claimed to achieve is now thought to be illusory and what they used to abhor is now considered to be the “historically legitimate” direction does not make a real difference. This peculiar continuity can be most directly seen in the minutely detailed works written by

professors of modern Hungarian history at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest and a circle of scholars in the Institute for Political History (former Institute for Party History). These studies cover Party politics, the Communist policy towards the Church, the Jews, and other segments of the society, as well as diplomatic affairs of the post-war period and economic policy.¹²⁴ Those works that intend to analyze the events from a perspective different from party politics also failed to avoid the same descriptive language. For instance, the otherwise interesting and comprehensive attempt of Mária Palasik to grasp the transformation of the legal system and the failure to form the rule of law in Hungary after World War II provides a narrative of party conflicts and ends with a political history of the birth of the one-party system.¹²⁵ It is worth mentioning that this group seems to take the most ardent opposition against any constructivist critique of historical practice. They tend to defend their 'objectivist' standpoint claiming the status of legitimate historical investigation. At the same time they employ a largely outmoded vision of history aimed at a monophonic and monolithic interpretation of historical processes. In this vision, these historical processes are understood as the result of party politics, elite discourses, diplomatic maneuvers, and political decision. For them only such a univocal and politics-centered narrative can properly represent the past. Unfortunately, this attitude almost monopolized history education as well.¹²⁶

Nevertheless, the dominance of this descriptive structure is not completely inimical to debate. There are two characteristic tendencies in the historical appraisal of the Communist system. The first one tends to accept the necessity of the radical social engineering and transformation that occurred after 1945 as among the unavoidable pre-conditions of modernization. These scholars consider the one-party dictatorship to be an 'unnecessary excess' and a consequence of Soviet dominance, which was constantly an object of reform and transformation attempts from 1953 onwards.¹²⁷ The emphasis on Soviet influence connects these views to the second approach that takes the entire post-war period as a derailment of Hungarian history.¹²⁸ Contrary to the first approach, the historians belonging to the second camp see 1945 not as a necessary, if dictatorially executed step towards modernity, but rather as the beginning of a 'Sovietization' that created a dictatorship alien to Central European and Hungarian historical traditions. Using this narrative, albeit in a nuanced way, Ignác Romsics authored the work that is the

most influential and of the highest quality.¹²⁹ The extremist version of this explanation, however, tends to depict the Communist system simply as a conspiracy of the Red Army and the Soviet security services.

Those scholars who are dissatisfied with this mode of representation often turn to the language of social history. This solution, however, in most cases reproduces the image of the opposition of a small ruling group and the oppressed masses of the people. This is due to the fact that social history generally constructed the concept of 'society' over and against that of the 'state.' This conceptual opposition between society and the state has an immediate political significance in the historical work on the Communist dictatorship. The most comprehensive work was written by Tibor Valuch, who attempted to analyze the structure of Hungarian society in the second half of the 20th century. Others chose to write accounts of urban society and industrialization, or peasant communities and state repression.¹³⁰ The 1990s in general witnessed an increased interest in rural society throughout the history of Hungary, including that of the most recent times.¹³¹ A sub-topic of the analysis of social changes is the investigation of demographic tendencies and migration.¹³² The number of attempts to understand the system in terms of ideology or intellectual history is relatively trifling and those authors who take this line concentrate mainly on the Party elite, a choice integral to their approach. In spite of this fact, considerable results were achieved like Melinda Kalmár's exciting investigation into the Kádárist attempt to reformulate the Communist ideological system after the shock of 1956 or Éva Ständeisky's detailed analysis of the relationship between authors and power.¹³³

Promising initiatives to formulate an alternative language come from border territories of historiography like historical anthropology or border areas of different disciplines such as sociology or the history of political science. A characteristic scholarly undertaking is that of the leading political sociologist Tibor Huszár, who himself was part of the Socialist academic network in the 70s and 80s. He sought to understand the mechanism of the power-system through meticulously detailed analysis of actual decision-making in different areas of politics.¹³⁴ Apart from Huszár, this field includes attempts to understand the dictatorship in terms of commemorations, burial rituals, and peasant culture or mentality. However, only a few of them manage to avoid drawing a sharp borderline, often with apologetic intention, between

state and society. Successful exceptions to this, and potential inspirations for further research, are the works of István Rév¹³⁵ and Tibor Dessewffy.¹³⁶

The fact that the traumatic events of contemporary history hinder the formation of a widely-accepted interpretation and their representation is highly contested cast doubts on the possibility of producing objective historical knowledge and diverted attention towards the subjective aspects of this process. The problematic relationship of history and memory, the role memory plays in the formation of historical consciousness, the analysis of commemorative rituals, and the nature of collective memory came into the fore. In Hungary, these tendencies appeared primarily in the research on the Communist regime. Originally, scholars aimed at recording the purposes of the official politics of memory and establishing various sources of 'counter-narratives.' Thus, historians investigated historical anniversaries, the commemoration of great personalities of the past, and the modes of representation in monumental statues in both Hungarian Communist systems (1919 and 1945 to 1989).¹³⁷

Recently, however, it has also become clear that this approach could generate one of the most innovative trends in contemporary historical research, especially on recent history, capitalizing on the theoretical and methodological potency of the relationship between memory and history. Problematizations of the concepts of time and history in commemorative acts or individual attempts at the reconstruction of the continuity of past and present appeared in the scholarship.¹³⁸ This tendency, however, characterized the broadly conceived period of Hungarian modernity and modern history and extended over the remembrance of the 1848–49 Revolution and the canonization of the collective memory and mythology related to the dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy.¹³⁹ The attraction of the theme is aptly marked by the re-publishing of one of the first attempts, a cheap paper back edition of a volume on the monuments of 1945–1949, in a finely illustrated extended edition.¹⁴⁰

A characteristic line of the reappraisal of recent history is the sequence of biographical monographs. The seminal book of János M. Rainer, director of the 1956 Institute, on Imre Nagy, Prime Minister in 1956, opened up this direction. It was soon followed by the academic reintegration of other contested figures into the canon of mod-

ern Hungarian historical heroes. Biographies of the young Communist heretic Géza Losonczy and of Zoltán Tildy, the former President of the Republic (1946–1948), were soon to follow.¹⁴¹ The subjective aspect of historical construction directed attention towards individual memory. This shift called for a critical reflection on the broader problem of the production of personal life narratives and the re-construction of individual lives in general. At this point historians were forced to seek solutions to the difficulties the textuality and narrativity of these sources raised and turned towards concepts derived from disciplines like psychology, anthropology, or literary criticism contributing thereby to the interdisciplinarity of historical research as well.¹⁴²

11. OVERLAPPING PASTS: HUNGARY AND ITS NEIGHBORS

Compared to the atomized nature of historiographies in the region, the study of the history of the neighboring countries had fairly good potential to emerge as one of the more visible branches of research in Hungary, the “eternal” conflict between the different national narratives notwithstanding. Between 1945 and 1948, research in a Central European context had a short but unprecedented flourishing. This was partly due to extra-scientific reasons, like the preparation for the peace treaty, and this was also the short period in which the infrastructural investments of the 30s, when a series of researchers were trained in the culture and history of the neighboring countries, began to pay off. Some of the leading scholars actually came from the Hungarian minority of the successor-states, others were close to the populist tradition that had an open sympathy with the Eastern European “peasant nations,” while others were raised in the spirit of Szekfű’s historical perspective, combining an apologetic interest in defending the “Hungarian position” with a real scientific effort to actually compete with the historians of “the neighbors” on the battlefields of the shared past. The generation of Domokos Kosáry, Zoltán I. Tóth,¹⁴³ László Makkai, and László Hadrovics, to mention but a few, wrote a series of important works in this short period. Even though the *loci* of their co-operation (like the Teleki Institute) were ultimately destroyed, and some of them were temporarily marginalized in the 50s, in the long run, these people had a remarkable impact on Hungarian historiography.¹⁴⁴

Their efforts were complemented by the work of a group of histo-

rians that emerged in the 50s. This group dealt with Eastern European history from a Marxist point-of-view but was equally interested in the history of the nationality question in the broader region. Some members of this group were Emil Palotás, Emil Niederhauser, Dániel Csátári, and Endre Kovács. From among them, the *oeuvre* of Niederhauser, focusing on the comparative history of national awakenings in Eastern Europe, is probably the most important. Although the climax of this generation was in the 70s, Niederhauser published a synthetic work as late as in the mid-90s on the history of Eastern European historiography.¹⁴⁵ This work shows both the strong points and the weaknesses of post-1956 Hungarian research on Eastern Europe. It is marked by a sincere empathy towards all the nations, it is devoid of farfetched generalizations at the expense of countries and cultures historically in conflict with Hungary, and it also features a remarkable positivist effort to collect and organize source materials. At the same time, it is marked by an almost total lack of interest in modern methodologies of history-writing, which in the last thirty years in the West re-shaped the research into the history of historiography.

Of course, it should not be expected of every scholar of the history of historiography to necessarily apply the conceptual framework of Frank Ankersmit or Hayden White. But there are certain problems (like the narrative typologies of historiographical texts, the question of common *topoi*, and their provenance, and the problems pertaining to conceptual history) which make our map much more complex and give the historian much broader interpretative space to grasp the complexity of these texts, rather than simply registering what a given historian was actually writing about. It is to be mentioned, however, that, besides this work, Niederhauser also remained an important mediator between contemporary Slovak historiography and the Hungarian academic public. His review articles published in *Századok* followed the academic developments in the neighboring country closely and were markedly devoid of any nationalistic bias.

As for the historical image of the region, there is a certain tendency of de-ideologization (going against the general trend of re-ideologization in the entire craft), which seems to turn work on the region into a “normal science,” gradually getting rid of the normative images of Central Europe so prominent in the 1980s. Compared to the Eastern European average, there is a relatively large number of translations

from the historiographical output of neighboring countries. Some of the key works by, for example, Dušan Kováč, L'ubomír Lipták, and Lucian Boia are also available in Hungarian, though it is to be added that these editions were often produced by Hungarian editing houses in Slovakia or Romania.¹⁴⁶ At the same time, there is a clear upsurge of interest in a certain nationalist genre of the "*lieux de memoire*" that seeks to shape the ethno-national narrative in terms of a "historical" contest with the neighbors and market it to the broader public.

In the 90s, Romania and Slovakia emerged as the regionally most important objects of research activities, a fact that obviously has to do with the presence and considerable size of Hungarian minorities in the two countries. One has to mention two extremely active personalities, who have been busy teaching, organizing conferences, editing, and publishing, thus considerably contributing to the overall academic culture of the country. They emancipated their fields from primary political connotations and also from the exclusive concentration on the situation of the Hungarian minorities in the respective countries.

In the Slovak case it is László Szarka, who also heads the Institute of Minority Studies of the Academy of Sciences. He initiated a series of projects and also published an important book on the Slovak question in the late 19th century. This book gave a very balanced narrative of the assimilatory politics of the Hungarian state and the corresponding hardening of the Slovak elite's position regarding possible cooperation.¹⁴⁷ In the field of Romanian studies, Ambrus Miskolczy was a similarly active figure, publishing a series of important works on Romanian historiography, ethnography, and political culture.¹⁴⁸ From the younger generation, Transylvanian-born diplomatic historian Béla Borsi-Kálmán must be mentioned. He published a series of important books on the diplomatic interaction between Hungarian and Romanian revolutionary emigrés throughout the 1840–60s and attempted to interpret the ups and downs of their negotiations in view of the evolution of Romanian national ideology.¹⁴⁹ While functioning mainly as a minority-policy think-tank, the Teleki László Institute also had an impact on the re-thematization of Hungary's geopolitical position and the history of Hungarian minorities in neighboring countries. Last, but not least, literary studies also contributed to the growing cultural awareness to the culture of Hungary's neighbors. An important author in this disciplinary borderland is Endre Bojtár, whose main field of

interest is Baltic studies, but he also made contributions to the intellectual history of Central Europe on the whole.¹⁵⁰

Up to 1918, the history of Upper Hungary and Transylvania is not considered a separate branch of research in Hungarian historiography, although in certain cases we can find region-specific topics and monographs. At the same time, the history of Transylvania is often dealt with separately, by local historians, who are also present in the Hungarian “academic market.” They also have their own Transylvanian-Hungarian institutional framework, having even different research “schools,” while this is far from the case in Slovakia, where the Hungarian minority had a more limited output of academic culture. This is probably due to a combination of reasons: on the one hand, the number of the Transylvanian Hungarian minority is substantially larger, on the other hand, there has been a continuously existing framework of elite reproduction, despite the growing restrictions in the 70s and 80s.

As opposed to the case of Hungarian historiography, the 90s meant for Hungarian historians from Romania a chance for radical transformation. The disappearance of oppression did not mean immediate expansion, or even radical transformation, however, due to the lack of a middle generation. Thus, the restoration of Hungarian academic institutions in Transylvania usually meant the re-emergence of the persons and institutional settings of the 1950s and 60s, the last period when there was a relatively strong independent Hungarian research infrastructure.

The key figures of Hungarian historiography in Romania are veterans of the profession like the cultural historians Samu Benkő,¹⁵¹ István Imreh, Zsigmond Jakó,¹⁵² and Ákos Egyed,¹⁵³ or the social historians Elek Csetri and Lajos Demény. While retaining a high level of professional ethos, this generation represents the historiographical convictions and methodological canons of the 1960s, concentrating mostly on social and socio-cultural history. At the same time, the enormous pressure on the part of the Transylvanian Hungarian community, eager to reshape its collective identity after 1989, pushed these scholars to publish on virtually everything, seeking to re-establish a kind of local canon and institutionalize a public memory of the Transylvanian Hungarians, often with a special eye for the history of the Szeklers.¹⁵⁴ While generally grossly under-represented, a younger generation nevertheless obtained some positions in the 1990s. Judit Pál (Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj)¹⁵⁵ works on the 19th century, and especially urban history

in Transylvania, Kinga Tüdös¹⁵⁶ (N. Iorga Historical Institute, Bucharest), combines ethnography and history, while Edit Szegedi works on the history of Transylvanian Saxons.

Generally, in connection with Transylvanian Hungarian historiography one can speak of a considerable thematic expansion, without the emergence of a compact new generation. In many ways, this is the reason why this branch of historiography, despite the remarkable shift in the external conditions, did not fundamentally problematize or change its discursive positions. While some of the above-mentioned older historians publish in both languages and target two audiences, usually they (the older ones as well as the younger) fail to mediate between the two historiographies. Rather, they produce two (or even three) different sets of narratives. One focuses on somewhat non-ideological social history, for the Romanian—rather thin—academic audience interested in their topic. Another targets the Hungarian professional and semi-professional audience, concentrating on broader questions of Transylvanian history. Yet another is for the local Transylvanian Hungarian public, which is searching for a viable narrative of identity and a normative past in the works of “its” intelligentsia. While this multiplicity has positive sides as well, it often prevents the different readerships from facing each other’s discourses and thus contributes to the “peaceful, but non-overlapping, coexistence” of these publics rather than to the sometimes painful, but in the long run most probably unavoidable, coming to terms with cultural and political otherness.

12. CONCLUSION: PLURALITY INCORPORATED?

Though the purpose of our study (to provide a critical and comprehensive picture on the first decade of Hungarian historiography after 1989) precludes us from going into detail concerning the most recent developments of the discipline, the half decade that has passed since the millennium calls for at least a brief evaluation.

One of the most striking developments that can be seen even from this very limited perspective is that the significance of social history has increased due to emergence of an active new generation of young historians. A cohort of students found a place in the already formed institutions of social history research for conducting their Ph.D. studies. In some cases, they also have found employment despite the gen-

eral lack of new openings in the departments and research institutions of history. Thus, social history did not merely provide a descriptive language and an attractive research agenda through which the upcoming generation could situate itself within the discourse of the discipline, but also a site of institutionalization, if only to a limited extent. The programmatic social history journal *Korall*, launched by these young historians has managed to gather some of the most talented members of their generation as well as to integrate some of the most prominent senior social historians (e. g., Bácskai, Gyáni, Kövér, Valuch). The periodical publishes thematic issues ranging from gender history, consumption, workers, urban history to historiography and historical theory. Over the last four years of its existence it has established its place among the most prestigious scholarly periodicals in the country. Within this framework gender studies also seems to abandon its original more openly politicized form and obtain a more coherently structured scholarly agenda.¹⁵⁷

Some members of the new generation have already published their first books in the field of urban history or social stratification.¹⁵⁸ Recently, the subject of the welfare system and social policy has begun to attract considerable attention.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, the paradigm of social history has provided attractive topics in the field of recent history as well.¹⁶⁰ Some members of the new generation sought to turn to the problems of methodology much more rigorously than their predecessors. Most of them spent considerable time at Western universities, are fluent in foreign languages, and developed a remarkable sensitivity to the theoretical issues of contemporary historiography. They seek to develop a critical perspective on the methods of historical research and the modes of its representation. Thus, they play a significant role both in the mediation of historiographical thinking and theoretical work itself.¹⁶¹

Nevertheless, it would be misleading to interpret these developments as any sort of breakthrough by a new generation. The historical sections of bookshops, the educational curriculum, as well as the most well-funded projects of research are still dominated by the tendencies characterizing the mid-1990s. In this regard, historical scholarship follows the lines drawn during the last decade of the previous century. Political biographies occupy a significant proportion of publishing.¹⁶² The 1956 Revolution continues to provoke divergent assessments and

will provide tremendous tasks for a long time.¹⁶³ Medieval studies preserves its peculiar social and economic history research agenda.¹⁶⁴

To sum up, Hungarian historiography has undergone a remarkable transformation after 1989—even if in personal, ideological, and infra-structural terms the change was far from abrupt. However, the most important marker is probably not the (imaginary or real) end-point of the transition process, but rather the process itself, the spectacular dynamism of different, sometimes mutually reinforcing, sometimes opposed projects of reshaping the public and academic discourses, and the ensuing interplay of different conceptions of the past.

Due to the relatively high level of de-ideologization of Hungarian historiography at the turn of the decade, the 90s were marked by various attempts to bring back a more ‘coherent’ image of history that had been gradually dissolved by the positivist consensus of professional historiography in the previous two decades. One such attempt was connected to the adaptation of various Western methodologies, which promised a more sophisticated relationship between the historian and his source-material, thus seeking to problematize the naïve-factological methodology. Along these lines, various schools and ideological directions emerging in the last two-three decades in Western Europe and the United States were offered to the broader public: post-structuralism, microhistory, oral history, historical anthropology, contextualist intellectual history, gender history, etc. As in all other Eastern European countries, this process of adaptation took place at an accelerated speed, often concentrating merely on the very act of reception of the Western achievements, without making it possible for the representatives of these canons to engage in a more detailed negotiation among their respective discourses.

Not so surprisingly, those methodological offerings that questioned the previously unambiguous relationship between “the past” and its representation were unable to challenge the firm objectivistic conviction of the “guild.” This was partly due to their relatively belated reception. Those theoretical considerations that eventually incited a ‘critical turn’ in the discipline in the West arrived in Hungary only in the 90s. Thus, for instance, the “narrativist” program put forward by Hayden White (who turned out to be one of the most quoted authors of the “relativist” critique of history-writing in Hungary as well) could be easily dismissed by pointing out that in the meantime it also fell prey to a more recent

wave of criticism “in the West.” The fact that even certain well-positioned historians called attention to the epistemological gap between the past *an sich* and its scholarly interpretation thus did not really shake the positivist consensus.¹⁶⁵ Historians were either absolutely uninterested in and ignorant of the post-modernist challenge or classified it as an erroneous attempt to blur the border between historical truths and historical myths. Though some of these scholars were aware of the theoretical complexity of the constructivist critique and even tended to accept that the past could not be known in its entirety, they regularly insisted that history-writing was ultimately based on objective factual documentation, approximating, if only asymptotically, the “totality of knowledge.” Consequently, they also proved to be completely resistant to any subjectivist construction.¹⁶⁶

Another way of bringing ideology back to historiography became popular mainly due to the politicization of intellectual production throughout the decade. The cleavages between the various intellectual and meta-political sub-cultures that existed throughout the 1970s and 80s served as convenient structuring lines for the emerging multi-party system. Thus, some of the crucial points of—especially 20th-century—Hungarian history were turned into symbolic identity-markers for one group or another. Furthermore—with rather divergent intentions, means, and efficiency—all post-1990 governments made some efforts to devise an “official” discourse, prioritizing a certain combination of research institutions, historical figures, *lieux de memoire*, and cultural-historical references.

At the same time, while some of the historians emerged as leading politicians in the new set-up, the mainstream of the craft kept to its own standards of avoiding direct involvement with either “too theoretical” interpretative schemes, or “too topical” political narratives. Relying on more “ideological” narratives thus remained the strategy of the out-of-the-mainstream: providing “weapons” for those who were not yet accommodated, who previously had been marginal for some reason, or who already lost their impact as proper scholars but, capitalizing on their prestige, decided to have a second try as ideological gurus.

Predictably, some of these attempts of reshaping the discourse, injecting new trends and the respective human resources into the bloodstream of academia proved to be highly successful, others had

rather ephemeral success, while certain endeavors failed completely. What is common to all is that—no matter how fundamentalist their program of renovation had been—they were forced to get entangled with a complex dynamism of generations, parallel claims, institutions, and competing discourses. It remains to be seen—and most probably will be the topic of the essay that somebody will write in 2015 about the Hungarian historiography of the first decade of the third Millennium—whether this apparent plurality will have a *paideistic* value. That would entail the socialization of the old and new participants into a communicative culture, where one has to accept the existence of radically divergent approaches and ideological directions and, what is more, learn to translate them into one's own language in order to utilize some of their findings. Alternatively, plurality might well lead to the formation of mutually exclusive sub-cultures, based on specific internal norms of selection and vehement emotions towards the 'insiders' who seem to possess the truth, and towards the 'uninitiated,' who are at best 'uninterested' or right-away 'inimical.' In this case, it is a further question whether it will be possible at all to retain the plurality of sub-cultures in the long run. It may happen at some point that some political elite in power will tilt the balance to such an extent that it will become possible to re-impose a certain ideological homogenization.

As this very article has been the result of the collaboration of two young historians coming from markedly different methodological backgrounds, the authors hope that the very experience of plurality has its own moral. Although it is somewhat unlikely that an invisible hand will turn "private exclusivisms" into public virtue, it is not at all inconceivable that Hungarian academic culture, getting ever closer to the European (and, for that matter, extra-European) structures, institutions, and intellectual movements will be able to reformulate itself in a way that valorizes multiplicity not only in terms of the usual post-Herderian (or post-modern) legitimation, according to which every national culture adds something to the completion of human culture, but in the other direction as well, realizing that a culture gets richer and more interesting, and opens more windows to the external world, by the multiplicity of the pasts, sub-cultures, and alternative intellectual canons it manages to incorporate.

NOTES

- 1 Not much has been written on the history of modern Hungarian historiography. Probably the best classical overview is Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*. Léderer's *A magyar polgári történetírás rövid története* is dated, Gunst's *A magyar történetírás története* is very sketchy. Most recently, see Arpad von Klimó's broad-ranging interpretation: *Nation, Konfession, Geschichte*. On the 1989 turn, the first assessments in foreign languages were by Sasfi, "Die politische Wende und die Geschichtswissenschaften in Ungarn"; and Deák, "Hungary." For a recent polemic overview, see Gyáni, "Történetírásunk az évezred fordulóján." In general, social and economic historians seem to be the most reflective about their own practice. See Gyáni's *Történészdiskurzusok* and "Történetírásunk az évezred fordulóján" and Kövér, "A magyar gazdaságtörténetírás régi útjai" and "Elmélet és módszer a legújabb gazdaságtörténetírásban" in his *A felhalmozás éve*, 360-74, and the overview by Kovács and Melegh, "L'histoire sociale, par qui?"
- 2 Huszár, *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói*, esp. 38-44, 50-6, 85-93, 294-5. Romsics, *Hungary in the 20th Century*, 360, Glatz, "Hajnal István történetírása." On the Academy of Sciences see also Pótó, "Harmadik nekifutásra," 79-110., and Péteri, "Születésnap ajándék Sztálinnak," 18-35. On the replacement of the academic elite Bíró and Székelyi, "A tudomány újjáépítése, 1945-1950," 81-104. Although it was written from a late socialist perspective, the details of Ladányi, *Felsőoktatási politika* are also useful.
- 3 Ladányi, *Felsőoktatási politika*, 164-217.
- 4 Pach, (ed.), *Magyarország története tíz kötetben*.
- 5 Köpeczi, (ed.), *Erdély története*.
- 6 For the conflict between Hungarian and Romanian historians upon the appearance of the book, see Vincze, "Magyarellenes hecckampány Romániában." Some of the key texts were collected in the volume, edited by Péter, *Historians and the History of Transylvania*.
- 7 To name but a few prominent historians from these—sometimes overlapping—generations: the economic historians György Ránki, Iván T. Berend and Zsigmond Pál Pach; the historian of Eastern Europe, Emil Niederauser; the early-modernist social historian Ferenc Szakály; the cultural historian Domokos Kosáry; the political and cultural historian of the 17th and 18th centuries, Kálmán Benda; the cultural historian Péter Hanák, the political historian and historian of historiography Ágnes R. Várkonyi; the diplomatic historian István Diószegi; the historian of Protestantism Katalin Péter; the specialist of national liberalism György Szabad; the intellectual historian Miklós Lackó; the medievalist and historian of national identity Jenő Szűcs; the historian of the Enlightenment Éva H. Balázs; or the veteran medievalist Elemér Mályusz.
- 8 Romsics, *Bethlen István*.
- 9 Hanák, *Jászai Oszkár dunai patriotizmusa*.

- 10 See Litván and Szücs, *A szociológia első magyar műhelye*, a collection of texts which was seminal in the recovery of the heritage of Jászi and the civic radicals around the journal *Huszedik Század*. See also Litván, *Magyar gondolat, szabad gondolat* and Pók, *A Huszedik Század körének történetfelfogása*.
- 11 See Kövér, "Biográfia és történetírás," 150-7.
- 12 Glatz, "Szaktudományos kérdésfeltevések és történetpolitikai koncepció," and "Történetíró, jelenkor, interpretáció." Dénes, *A "realitás" illúziója*.
- 13 Hajnal, *Az újkor története*. (Reprint of the first edition from 1936). The articles of László Lakatos had a seminal role in Hajnal's re-integration into the historiographical pantheon. See his "Az elfelejtett Hajnal István," "Egy szociológus történetész: Hajnal István," and *Az élet és a formák. Hajnal István történelemszociológiája*, which is based on his doctoral dissertation of 1988.
- 14 A classical work in this genre is Závada's literary sociography entitled *Kulák-prés*.
- 15 For a representative survey on the situation of Hungarian historiography after 1989, see "AETAS-körkérdés a magyar történetírás szerkezetéről és intézményrendszeréről" (AETAS survey on the structure and institutions of Hungarian historiography). The list of participants included Vera Bácskai, Pál Engel, Gyula Erdmann, Tamás Faragó, András Gerő, Gábor Gyáni, Sándor Gyimesi, István Hiller, Zsigmond Jakó, György Kövér, Gyula Kristó, András Kubinyi, Ferenc Makk, Zsigmond Pál Pach, Emil Niederhauser, and Béla Várdy).
- 16 The series is called "Magyar Századok" (Hungarian Centuries), and was edited by the Pannonica editing house, between 1999 and 2000. The contributors were Gyula Kristó, Ferenc Makk, Tibor Almási, Iván Bertényi, István Draskóczy, Géza Pálffy, Gábor Ágoston, Teréz Oborni, János Barta, László Csorba, Jenő Gergely and Lajos Izsák.
- 17 Lendvai, *The Hungarians*.
- 18 Molnár, *A concise history of Hungary*; the original French version is *Histoire de la Hongrie*.
- 19 Kontler, *Millennium in Central Europe*.
- 20 See Benda, "A társadalomtörténetírás"; Gyáni and Kövér, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete*, 7. Gerő, "Előszó," in Hanák, *A Kert és a Műhely*, 7-8.; Glatz, "Amíg a szellem él" (preface to Hanák, *1867 – európai térben és időben*, 7-10).
- 21 The author's main publications in the decade include *Hétköznapi Budapest, Az utca és a szalon*; in English: *Parlor and kitchen: housing and domestic culture in Budapest, 1870-1940*. Ormos re-assessed the Horthy period from a different perspective, focusing on political history: "Jelző és történelem." Kövér gathered his publications from the last decade in his *A felhalmozás íve*.
- 22 Gyáni and Kövér, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete*, 192-6.
- 23 *Történetsszdiskurzusok; Posztmodern kánon*.
- 24 See the collective volume dedicated to Vera Bácskai: Bódy, Mátyay, and Tóth, (eds.), *A mesterség iskolája* and her *Városok és városi társadalom*

Magyarországon a XIX. század elején; Család, háztartás, társadalom a 19. század elején.

- 25 To name but a few works: Benda, "A tárgyak termelése és fogyasztása," 284-96. Rácz, *Parasztok, hajdúk, cívisek*; Hajdú, *Tisztikar és középosztály*; L. Nagy, *A haszonból élő kispolgár*; Csiki, *Az északkelet, kelet-magyarországi városi zsidóság gazdaság- és társadalomtörténete*; Mazsu, *The Social History of the Hungarian Intelligentsia in the 'Long Nineteenth Century'*; Timár, *Vidéki városiak*; Ö. Kovács, *Zsidók a Duna-Tisza közén*.
- 26 The origins of this conceptual dichotomy had a special political context similar to the one that prevailed in late socialist East-Central Europe. The absolutist state encapsulated all spheres of politics within its own power, leaving no space for overt political critique. Critics, therefore, transformed the language of critique into the discourse of morality. They denied speaking about changes in state structure and claimed to aim at the moral improvement of society. 'Society' was described a terrain independent of the state and also better in terms of morality. See Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*.
- 27 Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*; Valuch (ed.), *Hatalom és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*.
- 28 Vörös, *Hétköznapiak a polgári Magyarországon*.
- 29 Gyáni, "Mai várostörténet-írásunk"; Szakály, *Mezőváros és reformáció*; Bácskai, *Gyula gazdasága és társadalma a XV-XVI. században*. Most recently, see her *Városok Magyarországon az iparosodás előtt*.
- 30 Pető, *Nőhistóriák*; English translation: *Hungarian Women in Politics 1945-1951*.
- 31 Szende, "A női munka a középkori gazdaságban"; "Craftsmen's Widows in Late Medieval Sopron" in Hietala and Nilsson (eds.), *Women in Towns*, 13-24. Péter, "Női családfők Sárospatakon a 16. és 17. században." Gyáni, "Patterns of Women's Work in Hungary 1900-1930" and *Women as Domestic Servants*; Hadas (ed.), *Férfiuralom*. Lafferton, "Hysteria and Deviance in Fin-de-siècle Hungary"; Vári, "Női hisztéria Budapesten az 1880-as években"; Balogh and S. Nagy (eds.), *Asszonyorsók a 20. században*. See also a few women's biographies. E.g., Mona, *Schlachta Margit*.
- 32 See, for instance, Benda, "A társadalomtörténetírás," Kövér, "Milyenek vagyunk?"
- 33 A recent appraisal of modern French historiography along these lines is Philippe Carrard, *Poetics of the New History*.
- 34 One can mention here Imre Bán, Kálmán Benda, Tibor Klaniczay, Márton Tarnóc, László Makkai, Béla Köpeczi, Ágnes R. Várkonyi, Katalin Péter, Ferenc Biró, István Fenyő, and Domokos Kosáry.
- 35 Such works from the 1990s are Öze, "Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet"; Heltai, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok*; Hargittay, *Gloria, fama, literatura*; Imre, "Magyarország panaszja"; Kecskeméti, *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet*.

- 36 Kontler, *Az állam rejtelmek*; "William Robertson's History of Manners in German, 1770-1795"; "Historians from the Periphery. William Robertson and Mihály Horváth."
- 37 Some of her more important post-1989 works: *Téveszméink eredete; A toleranciától a szabadságig; Fehér jakobinizmus*.
- 38 For the program of the research project, and a personal recollection concerning the impact of the philosopher György Márkus, who was the first one in Hungary to use Peter Laslett's path-breaking edition of Locke in the 1960s, see Bence, "Márkus és a kulcsszavak."
- 39 Csetri, "Nem sokaság, hanem lélek"; *Egység vagy különbözőség?*
- 40 His latest synthesis is Bíró, *A felvilágosodás korának magyar irodalma*.
- 41 Fenyő, *Valóságábrázolás és eszményítés*.
- 42 Bene, *Theatrum Politicum*.
- 43 Takáts, "Politikai beszédmódok a magyar 19. század elején (A keret)."
- 44 Gángó, *Eötvös József az emigrációban*.
- 45 See Szabó, *Diszkurzív térben* and Szabó, (ed.), *Szövegvalóság*; Szabó, Kiss, and Boda (eds.), *Szövegváltozatok a politikára*.
- 46 *History-Image: Selected Examples of the Interplay between Past and Art in Hungary*, exhibition arranged by Katalin Sinkó and Árpád Mikó. The catalogue was also edited by them.
- 47 Galavics, *Kössünk kardot az pogány ellen*.
- 48 Some of their works had already been re-printed in the 1970s. Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon*. Domanovszky, *Gazdaság és társadalom a középkorban*. Mályusz's pre-1945 studies were re-published recently. *Népiségtörténet; Magyarország története a felvilágosodás korában; A középkori Magyarország település- és nemzetiségpolitikája*.
- 49 Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok*.
- 50 See, for example, Kristó, *Magyarország története 895-1301; Honfoglalás és társadalom; A korai magyar államról; Írások Szent Istvánról és koráról*; Kristó and Makk, (eds.), *Árpád előtt és után*. Makk, *Magyar külpolitika; A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig*. Kristó and Makk, (eds.), *Európa és Magyarország Szent István korában*.
- 51 For example, see the work of Zsoldos, *A szent király szabadjai*.
- 52 Engel, *A nemesi társadalom a középkori Ung megyében*. See also his textbook: *Magyarország története, 1301-1457* and his English-language synthesis: *The Realm of St. Stephen*.
- 53 Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1451*. Vols. 1-2..
- 54 Fügedi, *Az Elefánthyak*. English translation: *The Elefánthy: The Hungarian Nobleman and His Kindred*.
- 55 See, for instance, Ladányi, *Az önkormányzat intézményei és elméleti alapvetése az európai és hazai városfejlődés korai szakaszában*. Kubinyi, *Városfejlődés és városhálózat a középkori Alföldön és az Alföld szélén*.
- 56 Bak (ed.), *Coronations*, "Symbol-Zeichen-Institution: Versuch einer Systematisierung"; "The Kingship of Mathias Corvinus"; "Roles and Func-

- tions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386).” There is no room here to provide the reader with a full bibliography. Bak’s works until 1998 are listed in the following volume: Nagy and Sebők (eds.) ... *The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways*, 697-706.
- 57 Klaniczay, *A civilizáció peremén*. His work in English: *The Uses of Supernatural Power* and in German: *Heilige, Hexen, Vampire*.
 - 58 Pócs and Voigt (eds.), *Ősök, táltosok, szentek*. Magyar, *Szent László a magyar néphagyományban*. Tüskés and Knapp, “A katakombaszentek tisztelete”; Petneki, “Advenae et peregrini.” Klaniczay argued that Hungarian historical anthropology could be born from the co-operation of ethnography and history.
 - 59 *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban*; English edition: *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses*.
 - 60 Szakály, *Mezőváros és reformáció*.
 - 61 *Európa híres kertje: történeti ökológia tanulmányok Magyarországról*. She continued to publish on political history, see for example her *A tűzvész tanúi*.
 - 62 Monok, Németh, and Tonk, (eds.), *Erdélyi könyvesházak. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely*.
 - 63 Tóth, *Jobbágok, hajdúk, deákok*. Tóth (ed.), *Relationes missionariorum de Hungaria et Transilvania (1627-1707)*. Tóth, *Mivelhogy magad írást nem tudsz*; (English version: *Literacy and Written Record in Early-modern Central Europe*).
 - 64 Zimányi (ed.), *Óra szablya, nyoszolya*.
 - 65 *Papok és nemesek; Gyermek a kora újkori Magyarországon* (in English: *Beloved Children. History of Aristocratic Childhood in Hungary in the Early-modern Age*).
 - 66 Dávid and Fodor, (eds.), *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe*; Fodor, *A szultán és az aranyalma*.
 - 67 Pálffy, *A tizenhatodik század története*. See also his *A császárváros védelmében*.
 - 68 Recently, he edited the volume on József Hajnóczy in the series *Magyar szabadelvűek*.
 - 69 Kókay, *Kereszténység, felvilágosodás, nemzeti kultúra*.
 - 70 Kecskeméti, *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet*.
 - 71 Zemlényi, *Az európai udvari kultúra és a magyar irodalom*.
 - 72 Ács, *Az idő ósága – Történetiség és történet szemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban*.
 - 73 Kosáry, *Magyarország Európa újabb kori nemzetközi rendszerében; A felvilágosodás Európában és Magyarországon; Nemzeti fejlődés, művelődés, európai politika; Magyarok Európában III*. His latest synthesis is *Magyarország és a nemzetközi politika 1848–1849-ben*.
 - 74 *Magyar szabadelvűek*, 12 volumes, published in 1998 by the Új Mandátum editing house, the editor-in-chief of the series was András Gerő. The contributors were: László Csorba, Gábor Erdődy, Zoltán Fónagy, Anna Fábri, Gergely András, Róbert Hermann, Ferenc Kulin, István Margócsy, András Molnár, Gábor Pajkossy, János Poór, János Veliky; a shortened version was also published in English: András Gerő, (ed.), *Hungarian Liberals*.
 - 75 Gábor Erdődy, *Kényszerpályán*.

- 76 László Csorba, *A vallásalap "jogi természete."*; László Csorba and Ferenc Velkey *Reform és forradalom 1790 – 1849*.
- 77 Dénes, *Európai mintakövetés és nemzeti öncélúság*.
- 78 Kovács, *A megátalkodott jóhiszeműség esélyei*.
- 79 Balogh, *Politikai hisztériák Közép- és Kelet-Európában*.
- 80 Gerő, *The Hungarian Parliament: A Mirage of Power; Modern Hungarian society in the making: The unfinished experience*.
- 81 Lackó, *Széchenyi és Kossuth vitája; Halál Párizsban; Széchenyi elájul*.
- 82 *From Habsburg agent to Victorian scholar* (the original Hungarian version of the book is from 1985). Lately, Frank has been mostly dealing with the history of diplomatic connections of Hungary with Great Britain and the United States. See his *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making*.
- 83 Deák, "Nemzeti egyenjogúsító" kormányzati nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon. See also her "Együttműködés vagy konkurencia"; "A Habsburg Birodalom a nacionalizmus kihívásai között."
- 84 Gángó, *Eötvös József az emigrációban*.
- 85 For his implicit self-positioning, see Hermann, "Az 1848-49-es forradalom és szabadságharc a magyar történetírásban."
- 86 Incidentally, these two journals were at the root of the two most important post-1989 academic editing houses of the country, *Századvég* being the forefather of *Osiris*, while the editor of *Medvetánc* came to launch *Atlantisz*.
- 87 Pál Schiffer's classic *A Dunánál* (At the Danube) from 1987, the numerous films by János and József Gulyás, and the famous TV series by Gábor Hanák and Péter Bokor entitled "Századunk" (Our century).
- 88 After 1990, Miklós Szabó was member of parliament for the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ). For his post-1989 publicistic works, polemically written against the re-emerging nationalist historical discourse, see his *Múmiák öröksége*.
- 89 Szabó, *Az újkonzervativizmus és a jobboldali radikalizmus története (1867-1918)*.
- 90 Litván, *Íászi Oszkár*.
- 91 Pelle, *Íászi Oszkár*.
- 92 Ormos, *Hitler*.
- 93 Ormos, *Egy magyar médiavezér: Kozma Miklós*.
- 94 Romsics, (ed.) *Integrációs törekvések Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században*. Romsics, (ed.) *Magyarország és a nagyhatalmak a XX. században*; Romsics, *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében; Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században; Trianon és a magyar politikai gondolkodás, 1920-1953*.
- 95 See, most importantly, Lucian Boia's work, *Istoria și mit în conștiința românească*, which also has been translated into Hungarian.
- 96 Romsics, (ed.), *Mitoszok, legendák, tévhitek a 20. századi magyar történelemről*. It is somewhat paradoxical that while the conceptual apparatus implies a "post-modern" inspiration many of the young contributors represent a neo-conservative turn rather than any kind of deconstructionism.

- 97 Bán, *Pax Britannica: Wartime Foreign Office documents regarding plans for a postbellum East Central Europe*.
- 98 Vonyó, *Gömbös Gyula és a jobboldali radikalizmus*.
- 99 Ungváry, *Budapest ostroma*.
- 100 Erős, *A Szekfű-Mályusz vita*.
- 101 One of the characteristic figures was Ernő Raffay, secretary of state in the first government, and also author of strongly nationalist narratives, mainly about Transylvania. Raffay, *A vajdaságtól a birodalomig; Magyar tragédia: Trianon 75 éve*.
- 102 Schmidt, *Diktatúrák ördögszekerén*.
- 103 The historian and ethnographer László Kósa is the most important figure of this trend. For a representative volume, see Kósa (ed.), *Magyar művelődéstörténet*.
- 104 The breakthrough was Hanák (ed.), *Zsidókérdés, asszimiláció, antiszemitizmus*.
- 105 See, for example, Braham, *A népirtás politikája* (in English: *The politics of genocide*), Gerlach – Aly, *Az utolsó fejezet*.
- 106 Szita, *A zsidók üldöztetése Budapesten, 1944-45*; Molnár, *Zsidósors 1944-ben az V. (szegedi) csendőrkörületben*. To a certain extent Tamás Stark's demographic study can be mentioned here: *Zsidóság a vészidőszakban és a felszabadulás után 1939-1955*. In English: *Hungarian Jews During the Holocaust and after the World War II, 1939-1949*. Kádár and Vági, *Aranyvonat. Fejezetek a zsidó vagyon történetéből*. In English: *Self-financing genocide: the gold train, the Becher case and the wealth of Hungarian Jews*.
- 107 Prepuk, *A zsidóság Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században*. Ránki, *Magyarok-zsidók-nacionalizmus*. Ungvári, *Ahasvérus és Shylock; The 'Jewish Question' in Europe: The Case of Hungary*; Karsai, *Holokauszt*.
- 108 Mária M. Kovács's works represent a unique voice in this body of research. She tried to connect a thorough archival research into the institutional policies of certain layers of the Hungarian society with a broader theoretical interest in the nature of nation-building and the social context of ethno-political claims. See her *The Politics of the Legal Profession in Inter-war Hungary* and *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*, which is a reconstruction of the attitudes and policies concerning the Jews on the part of the advocates' and physicians' chambers. The Hungarian version was published as *Liberalizmus, radikalizmus, antiszemitizmus*.
- 109 Apart from the books see also the socio-political analyses of Standeisky, "Antiszemita megmozdulások Magyarországon a koalíciós időszakban" and Vörös, "Kunmadaras."
- 110 Pelle, *Az utolsó vérvádak*. On the one hand, the author maintains the presumption of traditional political history according to which the 'people' is not a participant in political decisions, therefore it is not an agent of history. On the other hand, the work depicts the 'people' as innocent,

which—despite its deep anti-Semitic aversions—is not able to carry out pogroms without the intervention of corrupted politicians. This interpretation is in many ways rooted in the romantic vision of the ‘people,’ influencing, on a different level, also the various modern historical approaches to popular culture, such as micro-history, ‘history from below,’ and historical anthropology.

- 111 Kende, *Vérvád* and “The Language of Blood Libels in Central and East European History.”
- 112 Komoróczy, Frojimovics, Pusztai, and Strbik, (eds.), *A zsidó Budapest*.
- 113 Komoróczy, *Bezárkózás a nemzeti hagyományba*.
- 114 *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció*. The debate is in *Budapesti Könyvszemle* 9 (Autumn 1997) and 10 (Spring 1998). Karády has published extensively in Western languages. For example, Karády and Don (eds.), *A Social and Economic History of Central European Jewry*.
- 115 *Iskolarendszer és felekezeti egyenlőtlenségek Magyarországon, 1867-1945; Zsidóság és társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek 1867-1945; Zsidóság Európában a modern korban* (in English: *The Jews of Europe in the modern era*); *Túlélők és újrakezdők*.
- 116 According to them, Hungarian society contained two distinct elements: a modernized urban section ranging from the working-class to the Jewish great capitalists, and a countryside agricultural sphere encompassing both the peasantry and the ethnically Magyar landowners. This scheme originally was applied to explain the reasons of Hungary’s backwardness and reluctance towards modernization.
- 117 Although the appearance of the book falls out of our temporal frame, it is important to mention here the work of János Gyurgyák, *A zsidókérdés Magyarországon*. Gyurgyák attempted to create a “third” narrative, concentrating on the problem of assimilation. He suggests that, contrary to the mainstream historical perception, this process turned out to be a failure, being based on an unspoken compromise where both sides (i.e., the Hungarian society and the Jewish community) were entering with a set of illusions. This made it impossible to re-evaluate the situation at a later point, when it became obvious that the assimilation—in the sense of complete melting into the majority—was possible for only a limited number of urban Jews, while the majority remained in the limbo of neither being rooted in Jewish culture, nor being accepted completely as full-fledge Hungarians. In Gyurgyák’s analysis, the tragic aspect of this story is that the only observers who actually pointed out this failure were the ideological anti-Semites, whose impact on Hungarian public culture grew especially after the traumatic events of 1918–20. They used the Jews as scapegoats for rationalizing the series of social, economic and cultural misfortunes that hit the Hungarian society, which made it impossible to discuss, in a less hysterical tone, the issue of Jewish assimilation and the potential ways out. After 1945, the Communist regime also sup-

pressed the problems of Jewish assimilation and, according to Gyurgyák, it is the new Hungarian democracy, emerging after 1989, that was given the opportunity to reconsider these problems in a new way. The book has the merit of giving a historical reconstruction, of hitherto unattained complexity, of the debates on the "Jewish question" from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century. At the same time, however, its ideological pretexts, which were in many ways fitting into the "neo-conservative" trend of the late 1990s, aiming at the re-evaluation of the historical pantheon and creating a new narrative which mixes ethnic and historical references, made his argument too loaded. The book also generated a series of analyses, ranging from enthusiastic praise to severe criticism.

- 118 *Törvénytelen szocializmus. A Tényfeltáró Bizottság jelentése*; Horváth (ed.), *Iratok az igazságszolgáltatás történetéhez*.
- 119 Izsák (ed.), *A Magyar Dolgozók Pártja határozatai 1948-1956*; Balogh (ed.), *A Magyar Szocialista Munkáspárt ideiglenes vezetőtöbbségeinek jegyzőkönyvei*; Pritz (ed.), *Bárdossy László a népbíróság előtt*; Sipos and Sipos (eds.), *Imrédy Béla a vádlottak padján*; Karsai and Molnár, *Az Endre – Baky – Jaross per*.
- 120 Litván (ed.), *The Hungarian Revolution of 1956: Reform, Revolt and Repression 1953-1963*. On 1956 see also Békés, *Az 1956-os magyar forradalom a világpolitikában*; Ripp, *Ötvenhat októbere és a hatalom*; Eörsi, *A Tűzoltó utcai fegyveres csoport a forradalomban*; Ferencváros 1956: *a terület fegyveres csoportjai*.
- 121 On the historiography of 1956 see Horváth, "1956 történetírása a rendszerváltás óta." The volume by Kahler and M. Kiss, *Kinek a forradalma?* is quite tendentious.
- 122 Kenedi, *Kis Állambiztonsági Olvasókönyv*; Kiszely, *ÁVH*. Gyarmati, (ed.), *Államvédelem a Rákosi-korszakban*.
- 123 There is only one considerable achievement of the research on opposition in Hungary: Csizmadia, *A magyar demokratikus ellenzék 1968-1988* Vols. 1-3. Tamás Kende argues in a recent article that the historiography of the Communist Party is still configured by a quest for conspiracies and the Great Plan. "A Nagy Terv, avagy kik azok a kommunisták."
- 124 See e.g.: Glatz, (ed.), *The Stalinist Model in Hungary*; Pölöskei, Gergely and Izsák, (eds.), *Magyarország története 1918-1990*, Izsák, *Polgári pártok és programjaik Magyarországon 1944-1956*; Izsák, *Rendszerváltástól rendszerváltásig*. Feitl, Izsák, Székely (eds.), *Fordulat a világban és Magyarországon, 1947-1949*, Borhi, *A vasfüggöny mögött*, Borhi, *Megalkuvás és erőszak*; Borhi, *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945-1956*. Föglein, *Államforma és államfői jogkör Magyarországon 1944-1949*. Fülöp, *A befejezetlen béke*. Földes, *Az eladósodás politikatörténete 1957-1986*.
- 125 Palasik, *A jogállamiság megteremtésének kísérlete és kudarca Magyarországon 1944-1949*.
- 126 A recent attempt to justify this behaviour is in Pritz's "Történetírásunk egynémely problémájáról."

- 127 Iván T. Berend's works mark this approach: *Central and Eastern Europe 1944-1993*. The Hungarian translation is titled: *Terelőúton*.
- 128 See e.g. Szerencsés, *Magyarország története a II. világháború után, 1945-1975*; Szerencsés, "Az ítélet: halál"; Szerencsés, *A nemzeti demokráciáért*; Földesi, *A Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottság Magyarországon 1945-1947*; Kahler, *Joghalál Magyarországon, 1945-1989*.
- 129 Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században*. English edition: *Hungary in the 20th Century*.
- 130 Belényi, *Az alföldi városok és a településpolitika (1945-1963)*; *A sztálini iparosítás emberi ára 1948-1956*; Erdmann, *Begyűjtés, beszolgáltatás Magyarországon, 1945-1956*; Csanádi, *Honnan tovább?*; Vida, *Az állami-politikai vezető réteg összetétele az 1980-as évek elején*; Varga, *Politika, paraszti érdekérvényesítés és szövetkezetek Magyarországon 1956-1967*. A comprehensive overview on research concerning contemporary history is in Püski, Timár, and Valuch, (eds.), *Hatalom és társadalom and Politika, gazdaság és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*.
- 131 Orosz, Für, and Román, (eds.), *Magyarország agrártörténete*; Gunst, (ed.), *A magyar agrártársadalom a jobbágyság felszabadításától napjainkig*.
- 132 Stark, *Magyarország második világháborús embervesztése*. In English: *Hungary's Human Losses in World War II*. Tóth, *Telepitések Magyarországon 1945-1948 között*; Vadkert, *A belső telepítések és a lakosságcsere*.
- 133 Kalmár, *Ennivaló és hozomány*; Ständeisky, Éva, *Az írók és a hatalom*; Rainer, M. János, *Az író helye*.
- 134 Huszár and Szabó, (eds.), *Restauráció vagy kiigazítás?* Huszár, *A politikai gépezet 1951 tavaszán Magyarországon*; Huszár, *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói*.
- 135 Rév "In Mendacio Veritas." "Parallel Autopsies"; "Az atomizáció előnyei." *Retroactive Justice*.
- 136 Dessewffy, *Iskola a hegyoldalban*. One should note here also the distinguished sociologist Elemér Hankiss's *Kelet-európai alternatívák*. English edition is *East European Alternatives*. Hungarian sociologist, Árpád Szokolczai, currently at the University of Cork, produced several historico-sociological works. See, for instance, his co-operative book with Á. Horváth, *The Dissolution of Communist Power: The Case of Hungary*.
- 137 Pótó, *Emlékművek, politika, közgondolkodás*; Gyarmati, Március *hatalma*; Gerő, *Az államosított forradalom*; Szabó, "Politikai propaganda és történelmi ünnep"; "Pártok, politikai propaganda, történelmi ünnepek Magyarországon 1945-1948"; Vörös, "Mitikus hős és példakép," "A múltat véggépp eltörölni"? "Az 1918-as magyar polgári demokratikus forradalom."
- 138 Róbert Braun's book, *Holocaust, elbeszélés, történelem* was path-breaking in this respect. See a summary of his argument in English: "The Holocaust and Problems of Historical Representation." K. Horváth, "Önarcképcsarnok" and "Elképzelt múlt, felidézett jövő." Apór, "Immortalitas Imperator," "The Creative Fear," and "The Eternal Body." Pető, "Átvonuló hadsereg, maradandó trauma"

- 139 K. Horváth, "Naplók és memoárok." Gergely Romsics, *Mítosz és emlékezet*.
- 140 Pótó, *Az emlékeztetés helyei: emlékművek és politika*.
- 141 Rainer, Nagy Imre. *Politikai életrajz*; Kövér, Losonczy Géza 1917-1957; Haas, *Diktatúrák árnyékában*; Horváth, Maléter Pál; a recent, debated work is Révész, *Aczél és korunk*.
- 142 The entire volume 2-3 in 2002 of the historical journal *Aetas* was dedicated to the problem of biography and life story. See also Kövér, *A felhalmozás íve*, esp. 31-131. and 384-409. Tóth, "Klió és az oral history" and "Mi lesz akkor, ha meggyökerezek?"
- 143 The least known of this group, Zoltán I. Tóth was an eminent scholar of Romanian national ideology, who was accidentally shot dead during a demonstration during the 1956 Revolution. His most important work was re-edited recently: *Az erdélyi román nacionalizmus első évszázada*.
- 144 See Kosáry, "The Idea of a Comparative History of East Central Europe."
- 145 Niederhauser, *A történetírás története Kelet-Európában*.
- 146 Boia, *Történelem és mítosz a román köztudatban*; Lipták, *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad: a történelemről és a történetírásról*; Kovács, *Szlovákia története*. In addition, various publications focused on the fundamental texts of the Romanian intellectual tradition. See, for example, the series edited by Miskolczi, and also Pászka, (ed.), *Román eszmetörténet, 1866-1945*; Kántor, (ed.), *Szegényeknek palota: XX. századi román esszék*; Iordachi, and Trencsényi, "A román történetírás kihívásai." Most recently, see Horváth, (ed.), *Tanúskodni jöttem*.
- 147 *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés – Magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867-1918*, Szarka, *Kisebbségi léthelyzetek – közösségi alternatívák*, Szarka, *Duna-táji dilemmák*.
- 148 Trócsányi and Miskolczi, *A fanariótáktól a Hohenzollernekig; Tündéerkert, and Két tanulmány*. See also Zoltán Szász's *A románok története*.
- 149 Borsi-Kálmán, *A békétlenség stádiumai; Kihívás és eretnecség; Kockázatos viszonyok* (translated into French as *Liaisons risquées: Hongrois et Roumains aux XIXe et XXe siècles*); *Consciences nationales, interférences et relations délicates; Illúziókergetés vagy ismétléskényszer? Nemzetfogalom és nemzetstratégiák* (translated into English as *Hungarian exiles and the Romanian national movement, 1849-1867*).
- 150 Bojtár, *Kelet-Európa vagy Közép-Európa?*
- 151 Benkő, *Újrakezdések*.
- 152 Jakó, *Társadalom, egyház, művelődés*.
- 153 Egyed, *Erdély, 1848-1849*. 2 Vols., (1998-1999). Egyed, *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély*. 2 Vols.
- 154 The most important source-edition is Demény, (ed.) *Székely Oklevéltár – Új sorozat* (Szekler Archives – New Series). Vol. IV. *Székely népességösszeírások 1545-1627* (Szekler census, 1545-1627). Vol. V. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635* (Szekler census, 1635). Vol. VI. *Székely népességösszeírások 1635-1653*.
- 155 Pál, *Procesul de urbanizare din scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea*.

- 156 Tüdös, *Erdélyi védőrendszerek a XV-XVIII. században: Háromszéki templomvárak*.
- 157 Lácza, ed., *Nők és férfiak...avagy a nemek története*; Schadt, *Feltörekvő dolgozó nő: nő az ötvenes években*.
- 158 Sonkoly, *Erdély városai a XVIII-XIX. században*; Bódy, *Egy társadalmi osztály születése: a magántisztviselők társadalomtörténete 1890-1938*; Husz, *Család és társadalmi reprodukció a 19. században*.
- 159 Tomka, *Szociálpolitika a 20.századi Magyarországon európai perspektívában*; Bódy, "A 'társadalom kora,'" Szikra, "Az 1891 évi betegbiztosítási törvény végrehajtása." *Korall's* volume 5-6 (Autumn-Winter 2001) is dedicated to the subject of work and social policy. See also Gyáni, "Könyörületesség, fegyelmezés, avagy a szociális gondoskodás genealógiája."
- 160 See the contributions to Rainer, (ed.), *Múlt századi hétköznapiak*. Horváth, *A kapu és a határ*. Horváth, Pethő, Tóth, (eds.), *Munkástörténet és munkásantropológia*. Kende and Somorjai, "Adatok a kommunista párttagság kérdéséhez BAZ megyében 1945-1948 között."
- 161 Szekeres, (ed.), *A történész szerszámosládája*. Bódy and Ö. Kovács, (eds.), *Bevezetés a társadalomtörténetbe*. In the Autumn of 2003 a debate was organized to assess the merits and shortcomings of the book, however it also contributed to the emergence of a more conscious theoretical thinking in history. "Vita a Bevezetés a társadalomtörténetbe című kötetéről."
- 162 Huszár, *Kádár János: politikai életrajz* vol. 1 and vol. 2; Palasik, *Kovács Béla, 1908-1959*; Földesi and Szerencsés, *A megőrzés hatalma: Pfeiffer Zoltán, 1900-1981*.
- 163 For the various, often still heavily politicized, trends, see Ripp, 1956. *Forradalom és szabadságharc Magyarországon*; Szakolczai and Varga, *A vidék forradalma, 1956*; Eörsi, *Mitoszok helyett – 1956*.
- 164 Csukovits, *Középkori magyar zarándokok*. Gyöngyössi, *Pénzgazdálkodás és monetáris politika a késő középkori Magyarországon*.
- 165 The medievalist Pál Engel asserted that although historical research may be positively evaluated, historical writing remains subjective. "Beszélgetés a 2000-ben Engel Pál történésszel," 4. Gyáni collected a bookful of studies with his arguments on the constructed nature of historical representation: *Emlékezés, emlékezet és a történelem elbeszélése*. Kövér also reflected upon the fictitious elements in historiography: "Korszakolás és korszaktudat," "Források – értelmezések – történelmek," and "Biográfia és történetírás."
- 166 Ormos, "Történelem és történetírás"; Romsics, "Az objektivitás mítosza és a mitizálás elfogadhatatlansága."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Pál Ács, *Az idő ósága—Történetiség és történet szemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* [The Antiquity of Time—Historicity and Historical Vision in Ancient Hungarian Literature] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- “AETAS-körkérdés a magyar történetírás szerkezetéről és intézményrendszeréről,” [AETAS survey on the structure and institutions of Hungarian historiography] in *Aetas* 4 (1993), pp. 165-212.
- Péter Apor, “Immortalitas Imperator: A Munkásmozgalmi Panteon születése,” [Immortalitas Imperator: The Birth of the Pantheon of the Labour Movement] in *Aetas* 17 (Vol. 2-3. 2002), pp. 179-205.
- Péter Apor, “The Creative Fear: Fascism, Anti-Semitism, Democracy and the Foundation of the People’s Democracy in Hungary,” in *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community*, edited by Bo Stråth (Brussels: PIE – Peter Lang, 2000), pp. 263-79.
- Péter Apor, “The Eternal Body: The Birth of the Pantheon of the Labour Movement in Budapest,” in *East Central Europe—L’Europe du Centre-Est: Eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 31 (Autumn 2004), pp. 23-42.
- Vera Bácskai, *Városok és városi társadalom Magyarországon a XIX. század elején* [Cities and Urban Society in the Beginning of the 19th Century in Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1988)
- Vera Bácskai, *Gyula gazdasága és társadalma a XV-XVI. században* [Economy and Society of the Town of Gyula in the 15th and 16th Centuries] (Gyula: Békés Megyei Levéltár, 1991)
- Vera Bácskai, *Család, háztartás, társadalom a 19. század elején* [Family, Household, Society in the Beginning of the 19th Century] (Budapest: Történeti Statisztikai Füzetek, 1992)
- Vera Bácskai, *Városok Magyarországon az iparosodás előtt* [Cities in Hungary before the Industrial Age] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- János M. Bak, ed., *Coronations: Medieval and Early-modern Monarchic Ritual* (Berkeley – Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990)
- János M. Bak, “Symbol-Zeichen-Institution: Versuch einer Systematisierung” in G. Melville, ed., *Institutionen und Geschichte* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1992)
- János M. Bak, “The Kingship of Mathias Corvinus: A Renaissance State?,” in Tibor Klaniczay – József Jankovics, eds., *Matthias Corvinus and the Humanism in Central Europe* (Budapest: Balassi, 1994)
- János M. Bak, “Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386),” in J. C. Parsons, ed., *Medieval Queenship* (Phoenix Mill: Alan Sutton, 1994)
- Iván Balog, *Politikai hisztériák Közép- és Kelet-Európában* [Political Hysteria in Central and Eastern-Europe] (Budapest: Argumentum, 2004)
- Margit Balogh and Katalin S. Nagy, eds., *Asszonyorsok a 20. században* [Women’s Lives in the 20th Century] (Budapest: BME Szociológia és

- Kommunikációs Tanszék – Szociális és Családvédelmi Minisztérium
Nőképviseleti Titkársága, 2000)
- Sándor Balogh, ed., *A Magyar Szocialista Munkáspárt ideiglenes vezetőtestületeinek jegyzőkönyvei* [The Minutes of the Sessions of Temporary Leadership of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party] 5 vols. (Budapest: Napvilág, 1993-1998)
- András Bán D., *Pax Britannica: Wartime Foreign Office Documents Regarding Plans for a Postbellum East Central Europe*. Boulder: Social Science Monographs, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997)
- Csaba Békés, *Az 1956-os magyar forradalom a világpolitikában* [The Revolution of 1956 in World Politics] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996)
- Gyula Belényi, *Az alföldi városok és a településpolitika (1945-1963)* [Cities of the Hungarian Plain and the Politics of Settlements] (Szeged: n. p., 1996)
- Gyula Belényi, *A sztálini iparosítás emberi ára, 1948-1956* [The Human Cost of Stalinist Industrialization, 1948-1956] (Szeged: JATE, 1993)
- György Bence, "Márkus és a kulcsszavak," [Márkus and the Keywords] in *Lehetséges-e egyáltalán? Márkus Györgynek—tanítványai* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1993), pp. 81-98.
- Gyula Benda, "A társadalomtörténetírás helyzete és perspektívái," [The State and Perspectives of Social History] in *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 33-42.
- Gyula Benda, "A tárgyak termelése és fogyasztása a jobbágyfelszabadítást megelőző évszázadban," [The Production and Consumption of Objects in the Century Preceded the Abolition of Serfdom] in *Néprajzi Értésítő* 76 (1994), pp. 284-96.
- Sándor Bene, *Theatrum Politicum* (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1999)
- Samu Benkő, *Újrakezdések: Tanulmányok, előadások, beszélgetések, búcsúztatások, 1980-1995* (New Beginnings: Essays, Lectures, Conversations, and Farewell Speeches, 1980-1995) (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia, 1996)
- Iván Berend T., *Central and Eastern Europe, 1944-1993* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Iván Berend T., *Terelőúton* [On Detour] (Budapest: Vince, 1999)
- Ferenc Bíró, *A felvilágosodás korának magyar irodalma* [Hungarian Literature in the Age of Enlightenment] (Budapest: Balassi, 1994)
- Judit Bíró and Mária Székelyi, "A tudomány újjáépítése, 1945-1950," [The Reconstruction of Science, 1945-1950] in *Szociológiai Szemle* 6 (Autumn – Winter, 1996), pp. 81-104.
- Zsombor Bódy, Mónika Mátyay, Árpád Tóth, eds., *Vera Bácskai: A mesterség iskolája* [The School of the Craft] (Budapest: Osiris, 2000)
- Zsombor Bódy, *Egy társadalmi osztály születése: a magántisztviselők társadalomtörténete 1890-1938* [The Making of a Social Class: The Social History of Private Employees] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2003)
- Zsombor Bódy, "A 'társadalom kora.' Munkásbiztosítás és munkaügy Magyarországon a 19. és a 20. század fordulóján," [The Age of Society: Work-

- ers' Insurance and the Question of Labor in Hungary at the turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries] in *Aetas* 19 (vol. 1 2004), pp. 5-30.
- Zsombor Bódy and József Ö. Kovács eds., *Bevezetés a társadalomtörténetbe* [Introduction into Social History] (Budapest: Osiris, 2003)
- Lucian Boia, *Történelem és mítosz a román köztudatban* [History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1999)
- Endre Bojtár, *Kelet-Európa vagy Közép-Európa?* [Eastern Europe or Central Europe?] (Budapest: Századvég, 1993)
- László Borhi, *A vasfüggöny mögött* [Behind the Iron Curtain] (Budapest: Ister, 2000)
- László Borhi, *Megalkuvás és erőszak* [Opportunism and Violence] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetem - MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997)
- László Borhi, *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945-1956: between the United States and the Soviet Union* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *A békétlenség stádiumai: Fejezetek a román-magyar kapcsolatok történetéből* [The Stages of Restlessness: Chapters from the History of Romanian-Hungarian Relations] (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Kihívás és eretnekség: Adalékok a román-magyar viszony történetéhez* [Challenge and Heresy: Contributions to the History of Romanian-Hungarian Relations] (Sepsiszentgyörgy: H-Press, 1996)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Kockázatos viszonyok: Írások a román irodalom, művelődéstörténet és nemzeti önszemlélet tárgyköréből* [Hazardous Relations: Writings on Romanian Literature, Cultural History and National Self-Perception] (Pécs: Jelenkor, 1997). Translated into French as *Liaisons risquées: Hongrois et Roumains aux XIXe et XXe siècles. Consciences nationales, interférences et relations délicates.* (Pécs: Jelenkor, 1999)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Illúziókergetés vagy ismétléskényszer? Román-magyar nemzetpolitikai elgondolások és megegyezési kísérletek a XIX. században* [Chasing Illusions or Complexes of Repetition? Romanian-Hungarian National Ideas and Attempts at Reconciliation in the 19th Century] (Bukarest, Budapest: Kriterion, Balassi, 1995)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Nemzetfogalom és nemzetstratégiák: A Kossuth-emigráció és a román nemzeti törekvések kapcsolatának történetéhez* [The Concept of the Nation and National Strategies: On the History of the Relations of the Kossuth Emigration and the Romanian National Aspirations] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1993)
- Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Hungarian Exiles and the Romanian National Movement, 1849-1867.* (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1991)
- Randolph L. Braham, *A népirtás politikája: a holokauszt Magyarországon* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2003). Original Edition: Randolph L. Braham, *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981)
- Robert Braun, "The Holocaust and Problems of Historical Representation," in *History & Theory* 33 (May, 1994), pp. 172-194.

- Róbert Braun, *Holocaust, elbeszélés, történelem* [Holocaust, Narrative, and History] (Budapest: Osiris, 1995)
- Philippe Carrard, *Poetics of the New History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)
- Márta Csanádi, *Honnan tovább?* [From Where To Go On?] (Budapest: T-Twins - MTA Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet, 1995)
- Lajos Csetri, "Nem sokaság, hanem lélek." *Berzsenyi-tanulmányok* ['Not Multitude, But Spirit': Studies on Berzsenyi] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi, 1986)
- Lajos Csetri, *Egység vagy különbözőség?* [Unity or Diversity?] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990)
- Tamás Csiki, *Az északkelet, kelet-magyarországi városi zsidóság gazdaság- és társadalomtörténete* [The Economic and Social History of the Urban Jewry in North-Eastern and Eastern Hungary] (Budapest: Osiris, 1999)
- Ervin Csizmadia, *A magyar demokratikus ellenzék 1968-1988* Vols. 1-3. [The Hungarian Democratic Opposition, 1968-1988] (Budapest: T-Twins, 1995)
- László Csorba, *A vallásalap "jogi természete."* *Az egyházi vagyon problémája a polgári átalakulás korában Magyarországon 1782-1918* [The 'Legal Nature' of the Foundations of Religion: The Problem of Church Assets in the Age of the Making of Modern Hungary 1782-1918] (Budapest: ELTE BTK Művelődéstörténeti Tanszék, 1999)
- László Csorba and Ferenc Velkey, *Reform és forradalom, 1790-1849* [Reform and Revolution, 1790-1849] (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1998)
- Enikő Csukovits, *Középkori magyar zarándokok* [Hungarian Pilgrims in the Middle Ages] (Budapest: História – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2003)
- Géza Dávid and Pál Fodor, eds., *Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe. The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest.* [The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, Politics, Society and Economy] Vol. 20. (Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2000)
- Ágnes Deák, "Nemzeti egyenjogúsító" kormányzati nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon, 1849-1860 [Governmental Policy in Hungary Aiming at 'National Emancipation', 1849-1860] (Budapest: Osiris, 2000)
- Ágnes Deák, "Együttműködés vagy konkurencia," [Co-operation or Concurrency] in *Aetas* 14 (Vol. 1-2 1999), pp. 43-61
- Ágnes Deák, "A Habsburg Birodalom a nacionalizmus kihívásai között," [The Habsburg Empire and the Challenges of Nationalism] in *Aetas* 12 (Vol. 4 1997), pp. 5-44.
- Istvan Deak, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Hungary," in *The American Historical Review* 97 (October 1992), pp. 1041-1063.
- Lajos Demény, ed., *Székely Oklevéltár – Új sorozat* [Szekler Archives – New Series] Vol. 4 *Székely népességösszeírások 1545-1627* [Szekler Census, 1545-1627] Vol. 5 *Székely népességösszeírások 1635* [Szekler Census, 1635] Vol. 6 *Székely népességösszeírások 1635-1653* [Szekler Census, 1635-1653] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1998-2000)

- Iván Zoltán Dénes, *A „realitás” illúziója. A historikus Szekfű Gyula pályafordulója* [The Illusion of ‘Reality’: The Turn of the Historian, Gyula Szekfű] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1976)
- Iván Zoltán Dénes, *Európai mintakövetés és nemzeti öncélúság. Értékvilág és identitáskeresés a 19-20. századi Magyarországon* [Following European Examples and Aiming at National Autarchy. Value-Systems and Search of Identity in 19-20th Century Hungary] (Budapest Új Mandátum Kiadó, 2001)
- Tibor Dessewffy, *Iskola a hegyoldalban* [School on the Hillside] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1993)
- Sándor Domanovszky, *Gazdaság és társadalom a középkorban* [Economy and Society in the Middle Ages] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1979)
- Ákos Egyed, *Erdély, 1848-1849* [Transylvania, 1848-1849] 2 Vols. (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia; 1998-1999)
- Ákos Egyed, *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély* [The Modernizing and Traditionalist Transylvania] 2 Vols. (Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémiai, 1997)
- Pál Engel, *A nemesi társadalom a középkori Ung megyében* [Noble Society in the Medieval Ung County] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1998)
- Pál Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1451*. Vols. 1-2. [The Secular Archontology of Hungary, 1301-1451] (Budapest: História – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Pál Engel, *Realm of Saint Stephen* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2001)
- Pál Engel, *Magyarország története, 1301-1457* [History of Hungary, 1301-1457] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1992)
- Pál Engel, “Beszélgetés a 2000-ben Engel Pál történésszel,” [Interview in the Journal 2000 with the Historian Pál Engel] in 2000 10 (December 1998), pp. 3-9.
- László Eörsi, *A Tűzoltó utcai fegyveres csoport a forradalomban* [The Tűzoltó Street Armed Group in the Revolution] (Budapest: Századvég - 1956-os Intézet, 1993)
- László Eörsi, *Ferencváros 1956: a kerület fegyveres csoportjai* [Ferencváros 1956: The Armed Groups of the District] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1997)
- László Eörsi, *Mitoszok helyett – 1956* [Instead of Myths - 1956] (Budapest: Noran, 2003)
- Gyula Erdmann, *Begyűjtés, beszolgáltatás Magyarországon, 1945-1956* [Gathering, Delivery of Agrarian Products in Hungary, 1945-1956] (Békéscsaba: Tevan, 1992)
- Gábor Erdődy, *Kényszerpályán. A magyar politikai gondolkodás 1849-ben*. [On a Forced Course. Hungarian Political Thought in 1849] (Budapest: Argumentum, 1998)
- Vilmos Erős, *A Szekfű-Mályusz vita* [The Debate of Szekfű and Mályusz] (Debrecen: Csokonai Kiadó, 2000)
- István Feitl, Lajos Izsák, Gábor Székely, eds., *Fordulat a világban és Magyarországon, 1947-1949* [The Turn of the World and Hungary, 1947-1949] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000)

- István Fenyő, *Valóságábrázolás és eszményítés. Irodalomkritikai gondolkodásunk fejlődése, 1830–1842* [Representation of Reality and Idealization: The Development of Our Literary Criticism, 1830–1842] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1990)
- Pál Fodor, *A szultán és az aranyalma. Tanulmányok az oszmán-török történelemről* [The Sultan and the Golden Apple: Studies on Ottoman-Turkish History] (Budapest: Balassi, 2001)
- Gizella Föglein, *Allamforma és államfői jogkör Magyarországon 1944–1949* [The Form of the State and the Rights of the Head of the State in Hungary 1944–1949] (Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1993)
- György Földes, *Az eladósodás politikatörténete 1957–1986* [Political History of the Running into Debt 1957–1986] (Budapest: Maecanas, 1995)
- Margit Földesi, *A Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottság Magyarországon, 1945–1947* [The Allied Control Commission in Hungary, 1945–1947] (Budapest: IKVA, 1995)
- Margit Földesi and Károly Szerencsés, *A megbélyegzés hatalma: Pfeiffer Zoltán, 1900–1981* [The Power of Condemnation: Zoltán Pfeiffer, 1900–1981] (Budapest: Kairosz, 2003)
- Tibor Frank, *From Habsburg Agent to Victorian Scholar. G. G. Zerffi 1820–1892* (Boulder – New York: Social Science Monographs – Columbia University Press, 2000).
- Tibor Frank, *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making. Studies in Hungarian Connections to Britain and America, 1848–1945* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1999)
- Erik Fügedi, *Az Elefánthyak* [The Elefánthy Family] (Budapest: Osiris, 1999) (first edition: 1992), English Edition: Erik Fügedi, *The Elefánthy: The Hungarian Nobleman and His Kindred* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1998)
- Mihály Fülöp, *A befejezetlen béke* [The Unfinished Peace] (Budapest: Héttony, 1994)
- Gábor Gángó, *Eötvös József az emigrációban* [József Eötvös in Emigration] (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1999)
- Géza Galavics, *Kössünk kardot az pogány ellen. Török háborúk és a képzőművészet* [Let Us Belt on Our Sword against the Heathen: The Turkish Wars and the Arts] (Budapest: Képzőművészeti Kiadó, 1986)
- Christian Gerlach – Götz Aly, *Az utolsó fejezet: réalpolitika, ideológia és a magyar zsidók legyilkolása, 1944–1945* [The Last Chapter. Realpolitik, Ideology and the Murder of the Hungarian Jews] (Budapest: Noran, 2005)
- András Gerő, *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making: The Unfinished Experience* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1995)
- András Gerő, *The Hungarian Parliament: A Mirage of Power*. Atlantic Studies on Society in Change, no. 92. (Highland Lakes: Atlantic Research and Publications, Inc., 1997)
- András Gerő, *Az államosított forradalom* [Etatized Revolution] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998)
- András Gerő, ed., *Hungarian Liberals* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1999)

- Nóra G. Etényi, "Államelmélet, politika és pamflet a 17. századi Európában," [Political Theory, Politics and Pamphlets in 17th-Century Europe] in *Aetas* 17 (Vol. 1 2002), pp. 15-35.
- Ferenc Glatz, "Szaktudományos kérdésfeltevések és történetpolitikai koncepció. A fiatal Szekfű Gyula bécsi éveinek történetéből," [Scholarly Questions and Historico-political Conceptions: From the History of the Young Gyula Szekfű's Viennese Years] in *Történelmi Szemle* 26 (Autumn 1974), pp. 396-420.
- Ferenc Glatz, "Történetíró, jelenkor, interpretáció. Történetpolitikai koncepció és 'történetfilozófiai' irányzat Szekfű Gyula, Der Staat Ungarn c. művében," [Historian, Contemporary Age, Interpretation: Historico-political Conceptions and 'Philosophy of History' in Gyula Szekfű's Der Staat Ungarn] in *Századok* 110 (March 1976), pp. 183-224.
- Ferenc Glatz, ed., *The Stalinist Model in Hungary* (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1990)
- Péter Gunst, *A magyar történetírás története* [The History of Hungarian Historiography] (Budapest: Csokonai Kiadó, 2002)
- Péter Gunst, ed., *A magyar agrártársadalom a jobbágyosság felszabadításától napjainkig* [The Hungarian Rural Society from the Abolition of Serfdom until Nowadays] (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998)
- Gábor Gyáni, *Women as Domestic Servants: The Case of Budapest, 1890-1940* (New York: Institute on East Central Europe, Columbia University, 1989)
- Gábor Gyáni, "Mai várostörténet-írásunk: teljesítmény és irányzatok," [Our Current Urban History: Achievements and Approaches] in *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 55-67.
- Gábor Gyáni, *Hétköznapi Budapest* [Everyday Budapest] (Budapest: Városháza, 1995)
- Gábor Gyáni, *Az utca és a szalon* [The Street and the Salon] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998)
- Gábor Gyáni, *Parlor and Kitchen: Housing and Domestic Culture in Budapest, 1870-1940* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2002)
- Gábor Gyáni, "Patterns of Women's Work in Hungary 1900-1930," in *European Review of History* 5 (Spring 1998), pp. 25-37.
- Gábor Gyáni, "Könyörületesség, fegyelmezés, avagy a szociális gondoskodás genealógiája," [Charity, Discipline or the Genealogy of Social Care] in *Történelmi Szemle* 41 (vol. 1-2 1999), pp. 57-84.
- Gábor Gyáni, "Történetírásunk az évezred fordulóján," [Our Historical Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium] in *Századvég*, Új folyam, 18 (2000), pp. 117-40.
- Gábor Gyáni, *Emlékezés, emlékezet és a történelem elbeszélése* [Remembering, Memory and the Narration of History] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000).
- Gábor Gyáni, *Történészdiskurzusok* [Historians' Discourses] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002)
- Gábor Gyáni, *Posztmodern kánon* [Postmodern Canon] (Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 2003)

- Gábor Gyáni and György Kövér, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a reformkortól a második világháborúig* [Social History of Hungary from the Reform Period until World War II] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- György Gyarmati, *Március hatalma—a hatalom márciusa* [The Power of March—The March of Power] (Budapest: Paginarium, 1998)
- György Gyarmati, ed., *Államvédelem a Rákosi-korszakban* [State Security in the Rákosi Period] (Budapest: Történeti Hivatal, 2000)
- Márton Gyöngyössi, *Pénzgazdálkodás és monetáris politika a késő középkori Magyarországon* [Management of Money and Monetary Politics in Hungary in the Late Middle Ages] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2003)
- János Gyurgyák, *A zsidókérdés Magyarországon* [Jewish Question in Hungary] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001)
- György Haas, *Diktatúrák árnyékában* [In the Shadow of Dictatorships] (Budapest: Magyar Napló, 2000)
- Miklós Hadas, ed., *Férfiuralom* [Men's Rule] (Budapest: Replika, 1994)
- Tibor Hajdú, *Károlyi Mihály. Politikai életrajz* [Mihály Károlyi: A Political Biography] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970)
- Tibor Hajdú, *Tisztikar és középosztály, 1850-1914* [Military Officers and Middle-Class] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999)
- István Hajnal, *Az újkor története* [History of the Modern Age] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988) (Reprint of the first edition from 1936)
- Péter Hanák ed., *Zsidókérdés, asszimiláció, antiszemitizmus* [Jewish Question, Assimilation, Anti-Semitism] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1984)
- Péter Hanák, *1867—európai térben és időben* [1867—in European Space and Time] (Budapest: História – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2001)
- Péter Hanák, *Jászi Oszkár dunai patriotizmusa* [The Danubian Patriotism of Oszkár Jászi] (Budapest: Magvető, 1985)
- Péter Hanák, *A Kert és a Műhely* [The Garden and the Workshop] (Budapest: Balassi, 1999) (second revised edition)
- Péter Hanák, *The Garden and the Workshop: Essays on the Cultural History of Vienna and Budapest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)
- Elemér Hankiss, *Kelet-európai alternatívák* [East European Alternatives] (Budapest: Közgazdasági- és Jogi Kiadó, 1989)
- Elemér Hankiss, *East European Alternatives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)
- Emil Hargittay, *Gloria, fama, literatura: az uralkodói eszmény a régi magyarországi fejedelmi tükrökben* [Gloria, Fama, Literatura: the Ideal of Rulership in Old Hungarian Mirrors of Princes] (Budapest: Universitas, 2001)
- János Heltai, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* [Péter Alvinczi and the Peregrinators to Heidelberg] (Budapest: Balassi, 1994)
- Róbert Hermann, "Az 1848-49-es forradalom és szabadságharc a magyar történetírásban," [The 1848-49 Revolution and War of Independence in Hungarian Historiography] in *Aetas* 14 (Vol. 1-2 1999), pp. 62-85.
- Ágnes Horváth and Árpád Szakolczai, *The Dissolution of Communist Power: The Case of Hungary* (London: Routledge, 1992)

- Andor Horváth, ed., *Tanúskodni jöttem. Válogatás a két világháború közötti román emlékirat- és naplóirodalomból* [I Came to Witness: Selection from the Memoire and Diary Literature of Inter-war Romania] (Bucharest: Kriterion, 2003)
- Ibolya Horváth, ed., *Iratok az igazságszolgáltatás történetéhez* [Documents to the History of Jurisdiction] 5 vols. (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi, 1992-1993)
- Miklós Horváth, *Maléter Pál* [Pál Maléter] (Budapest: Osiris – Századvég – 1956-os Intézet, 1995)
- Sándor Horváth, *A kapu és a határ: mindennapi Sztálinváros* [The Gate and the Border: Everyday Stalintown] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2004)
- Sándor Horváth, “1956 történetírása a rendszerváltás óta,” [The Historiography of 1956 since 1989] in *Századvég* 23 (Vol. 4 2001), pp. 107-119.
- Sándor Horváth, László Pethő, and Eszter Zsófia Tóth, eds., *Munkástörténet és munkásantropológia* [Labor History and Labor Anthropology] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2002)
- Ildikó Husz, *Család és társadalmi reprodukció a 19. században. Történeti-szociológiai tanulmány egy Buda környéki mezőváros társadalmáról a családszerkezet változásának tükrében* [Family and Social Reproduction in the 19th Century: Historical-Sociological Study on the Society of a Small Town near to Buda With Special Regards to the Changes in the Family Structure] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- Tibor Huszár and János Szabó, eds., *Restauráció vagy kiigazítás?* [Restoration or Correction?] (Budapest: Zrínyi, 1999)
- Tibor Huszár, *A politikai gépezet 1951 tavaszán Magyarországon* [The Political Machinery in Hungary in Spring 1951] (Budapest: Corvina, 1998)
- Tibor Huszár, *A hatalom rejtett dimenziói* [The Hidden Dimensions of Power] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1995)
- Tibor Huszár, *Kádár János: politikai életrajz* [János Kádár: A Political Biography] vol. 1: 1912-1956 (Budapest: Szabad Tér – Kossuth, 2001)
- Tibor Huszár, *Kádár János politikai életrajza* [János Kádár's Political Biography] vol. 2: 1957. november – 1989. június (Budapest: Szabad Tér – Kossuth, 2003)
- Mihály Imre, “Magyarország panaszja”: a *Querela Hungariae* toposz a XVI-XVII. század irodalmában [The Complaint of Hungary: the Topos of Querela Hungariae in the Literature of the 16th and Seventeenth Century] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995)
- Constantin Iordachi and Balázs Trencsényi, “A román történetírás kihívásai,” [Challenges to Romanian Historiography] in *Replika* 40-41 (November 2000), pp. 165-264.
- Zoltán I. Tóth, *Az erdélyi román nacionalizmus első évszázada* [The First Century of Romanian Nationalism in Transylvania] (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2000)

- Lajos Izsák, *Polgári pártok és programjaik Magyarországon 1944-1956* [Bourgeois Parties and Their Programmes in Hungary 1944-1956] (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Könyvtár, 1994)
- Lajos Izsák, *Rendszerváltástól rendszerváltásig* [From One Change of Regime to the Other Change of Regime] (Budapest: Kulturtrade, 1998)
- Lajos Izsák, ed., *A Magyar Dolgozók Pártja határozatai 1948-1956* [Resolutions of the Hungarian Workers' Party 1948-1956] (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998)
- Zsigmond Jakó, *Társadalom, egyház, művelődés: Tanulmányok Erdély történelméhez* [Society, Church and Culture: Studies on the History of Transylvania] (Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközössége, 1997)
- Gábor Kádár and Zoltán Vági, *Aranyvonat. Fejezetek a zsidó vagyon történetéből* [Golden Train: Chapters in the History of Jewish Wealth] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001)
- Gábor Kádár and Zoltán Vági, *Self-financing Genocide: the Gold Train, the Becher Case and the Wealth of Hungarian Jews* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004)
- Frigyes Kahler and Sándor M. Kiss, *Kinek a forradalma?* [Whose Revolution is It?] (Budapest: Püski – Kortárs, 1997)
- Frigyes Kahler, *Íggyhalál Magyarországon, 1945-1989* [Death of Legality in Hungary 1945-1989] (Budapest: Zrinyi, 1993)
- Melinda Kalmár, *Ennivaló és hozomány* [Food and Dowry] (Budapest: Magvető, 1998)
- Éva Kámán and Gyöngyi Heltai, 'A társadalomtudományi alaputatások finanszírozási rendszere, 1990-2001' [The System of Funding of Social Science Basic Research 1990-2001] in *Világosság* 44 (Vol. 1-2 2003), pp. 15-40.
- Lajos Kántor, ed., *Szegényeknek palota: XX. századi román esszék* [Palace for the Poor: Romanian Essays from the 20th Century] (Budapest: Balassi, 1998)
- Victor Karády and Yehuda Don eds., *A Social and Economic History of Central European Jewry* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990)
- Victor Karády, *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció* [Jewry, Modernization, Assimilation] (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1997)
- Victor Karády, *Iskolarendszer és felekezeti egyenlőtlenségek Magyarországon, 1867-1945. Történeti-szociológiai tanulmányok* [The Education System and Denominational Inequalities in Hungary, 1867-1945: Historical-Sociological Studies] (Budapest: Replika Kör, 1997)
- Victor Karády, *Zsidóság és társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek 1867-1945. Történeti-szociológiai tanulmányok* [Jewry and Social Inequalities 1867-1945: Historical-Sociological Studies] (Budapest: Replika Kör, 2000)
- Victor Karády, *Zsidóság Európában a modern korban. Társadalomtörténeti vázlat* [The Jews of Europe in the Modern Era: A Socio-Historical Outline] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2000)
- Victor Karády, *The Jews of Europe in the Modern Era: a Socio-Historical Outline* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004)

- Victor Karády, *Túlélők és újrakezdők: fejezetek a magyar zsidóság szociológiájából 1945 után* [Survival and Re-Starters: Chapters in the Sociology of Hungarian Jews after 1945] (Budapest: Múlt és Jövő, 2002)
- László Karsai, *Holokaust* [Holocaust] (Budapest: Pannonica, 2001)
- László Karsai and Judit Molnár, *Az Endre—Baky—Jaross per* [The Endre-Baky-Jaross Trial] (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1994)
- Gábor Kecskeméti, *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet. A magyar nyelvű halotti beszéd a 17. században* [Preaching, Rhetorics, Literary History. The Vernacular Funeral Orations in the 17th Century] (Budapest: Universitas, 1998)
- Tamás Kende, *Vérvád* [Blood Libel] (Budapest: Osiris, 1995)
- Tamás Kende, "The Language of Blood Libels in Central and East European History," in László Kontler, ed., *Pride and Prejudice* (Budapest: History Department of the Central European University, 1994), pp. 91-104.
- Tamás Kende and Lehel Somorjai, "Adatok a kommunista párttagság kérdéséhez BAZ megyében 1945-1948 között," [Contributions to the Question of the Communist Party Membership in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County between 1945-1948] in *Levéltári Évkönyv* 10 (Miskolc, 2000), pp. 283-310.
- Tamás Kende, "A Nagy Terv, avagy kik azok a kommunisták," [The Great Plan or Who are the Communists?] in *Beszélő* 8 (December 2003), pp. 52-64.
- János Kenedi, *Kis Állambiztonsági Olvasókönyv* [Small Reader of State Security] (Budapest: Magvető, 1996)
- Zsolt K. Horváth, "Önarcképcsarnok. A személyes emlékezet mint történelmi probléma," [Self-Portrait Gallery: Personal Memory as Historical Problem] in András Szekeres, ed., *A történész szerszámosládája: A jelenkori történelmi gondolkodás néhány aspektusa* [The Toolkit of the Historian: Aspects in Contemporary Historical Thinking] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002), pp. 91-95.
- Zsolt K. Horváth, "Naplók és memoárok mint 'lehetséges történelmek': az 1848-49-es emlékezések történelmi képe és olvasási dilemmái" [Diaries and Memoirs as 'Possible Histories': The Historical Image and Dilemmas of Reading of Recollections of 1848-49] in *Alföld* 51 (Vol. 5. 2000), pp. 81-100.
- Zsolt K. Horváth, "Elképzelte múlt, felidézett jövő. Három séta az 'örökség' érdekében" [Imagined Past, Evoked Future: Three Walks in the Forest of 'Patrimony'] in *Múltunk* 45 (Vol. 3 2000), pp. 178-200.
- Gábor Kiszely, *ÁVH* [ÁVH – State Security Office] (Budapest: Korona, 2000)
- Gábor Klaniczay, *A civilizáció peremén* [At the Edge of Civilization] (Budapest: Magvető, 1990)
- Gábor Klaniczay, *The Uses of Supernatural Power* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990)
- Gábor Klaniczay, *Heilige, Hexen, Vampire* (Berlin: Klaus Wagenbach, 1991)
- Gábor Klaniczay, *Az uralkodók szentsége a középkorban* [The Sainthood of Rulers in the Middle Ages] (Budapest: Balassi, 2000)
- Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses* (Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

- Arpad von Klimo, *Nation, Konfession, Geschichte. Zur nationalen Geschichtskultur Ungarns im europäischen Ausland (1860-1948)* (München: Oldenburg, 2003)
- György Kókey, *Kereszténység, felvilágosodás, nemzeti kultúra* [Christianity, Enlightenment, National Culture] (Budapest: Universitas, 2000)
- Géza Komoróczy, *Bezárkózás a nemzeti hagyományba* [Self-Enclosing in the National Tradition] (Budapest: Századvég, 1990)
- Géza Komoróczy, Kinga Frojimovics, Viktória Pusztai and Andrea Strbik, eds., *A zsidó Budapest. Emlékek, szertartások, történelem* [Jewish Budapest. Memories, Rituals, History] (Budapest: Városháza – MTA Judaisztikai Kutatócsoport, 1995)
- László Kontler, *Az állam rejtelmek* [The Mysteries of State] (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1997)
- László Kontler, "William Robertson's History of Manners in German, 1770-1795," in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58 (January 1997), pp. 125-44.
- László Kontler, 'Historians from the Periphery. William Robertson and Mihály Horváth' in *The Hungarian Quarterly* 173 (Spring 2004), pp. 109-26.
- László Kontler, *Millennium in Central Europe: a history of Hungary* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1999)
- László Kósa, ed., *Magyar művelődéstörténet* [Hungarian Cultural History] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Domokos Kosáry, *Magyarország Európa újabb kori nemzetközi rendszerében* [Hungary in the Modern European International Order] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985)
- Domokos Kosáry, *A felvilágosodás Európában és Magyarországon* [Enlightenment in Europe and Hungary] (Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézet, Országos Pedagógiai Intézet, 1987)
- Domokos Kosáry, "The Idea of a Comparative History of East Central Europe: A Story of a Venture," in Dennis Deletant and Harry Hanak eds., *Historians as nation-builders: Central and South-East Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 124-138.
- Domokos Kosáry, *Nemzeti fejlődés, művelődés, európai politika* [National Development, Culture, European Politics] (Budapest : MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1989)
- Domokos Kosáry, *Magyarok Európában III. Újjáépítés és polgárosodás 1711-1867* [Hungarians in Europe. Vol 3: Reconstruction and Modernization 1711-1867] (Budapest: Háttér – Téka, 1990)
- Domokos Kosáry, *Magyarország és a nemzetközi politika 1848-1849-ben* [Hungary and the International Politics in 1848-1849] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999)
- Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis* (Oxford – New York – Hamburg: Berg, 1988)
- Dušan Kováč, *Szlovákia története* [History of Slovakia] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2001)

- Éva Kovács and Attila Melegh, "L'histoire sociale, par qui? Pour qui? Des tendances nouvelles de l'histoire sociale hongroise," in 'Le métier d'historien dans l'Est de l'Europe.' *Sources. Travaux historiques* no. 40., pp. 29-46.
- Gábor Kovács, *A megátalkodott jóhiszeműség esélyei* [The Chances of Stubborn Good Faith] (Budapest: Liget, 2001)
- Mária Kovács M., *The Politics of the Legal Profession in Inter-war Hungary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987)
- Mária Kovács M., *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Mária Kovács M., *Liberalizmus, radikalizmus, antiszemitizmus* [Liberalism, Radicalism, Anti-Semitism] (Budapest: Helikon, 2001)
- Béla Köpeczi, ed., *Erdély története* [History of Transylvania], vols. 1-3 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986)
- György Kövér, "Milyenek vagyunk?" [What are We Like?] in *Századvég* 4 (Spring 1997), pp. 43-54.
- György Kövér, *Losonczy Géza 1917-1957* [Géza Losonczy 1917-1957] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1998)
- György Kövér, *A felhalmozás íve* [The Trajectory of Accumulation] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2002)
- György Kövér, "Biográfia és történetírás," [Biography and Historical Writing] in *Aetas* 15 (Vol. 3 2000), pp. 150-7.
- Gyula Kristó, *A magyar nemzet megszületése* [The Birth of the Hungarian Nation] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár, 1997)
- Gyula Kristó, *Magyarország története 895-1301* [History of Hungary 895-1301] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Gyula Kristó, *Honfoglalás és társadalom* [Magyar Conquest and Society] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Gyula Kristó, *A korai magyar államról* [On the Early Hungarian State] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- Gyula Kristó, *Írások Szent Istvánról és koráról* [Papers on Saint Stephen and His Age] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2000)
- Gyula Kristó and Ferenc Makk, eds., *Európa és Magyarország Szent István korában* [Europe and Hungary in Saint Stephen's Age] (Szeged: Csongrád Megye Önkormányzata, 2000)
- Gyula Kristó and Ferenc Makk, eds., *Árpád előtt és után* [Before and After Árpád] (Szeged: Somogyi Könyvtár, 1996)
- András Kubinyi, *Városfejlődés és városhálózat a középkori Alföldön és az Alföld szélén* [Urban Development and Network in the Medieval Great Plain and Its Edge] (Szeged: Csongrád Megye Önkormányzata, 2000)
- Mihály Lackó, *Széchenyi és Kossuth vitája* [The debate of Széchenyi and Kossuth] (Budapest: Magvető, 1977)
- Mihály Lackó, *Halál Párizsban* [Death in Paris] (Budapest: Magvető: 1986)
- Mihály Lackó, *Széchenyi elájul* [Széchenyi Faints] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2001)

- Magdolna Lácza, ed., *Nők és férfiak...avagy a nemek története* [Women and Men...Or the History of Gender] (Nyíregyháza: Nyíregyházi Főiskola Gazdaság- és Társadalomtudományi Kara, 2003)
- Andor Ladányi, *Felsőoktatási politika, 1949-1958* [Higher Education Policy, 1949-1958] (Budapest: Kossuth, 1986)
- Erzsébet Ladányi, *Az önkormányzat intézményei és elméleti alapvetése az európai és hazai városfejlődés korai szakaszában* [Institutions of Autonomy and Its Theoretical Principles in the Early Period of European and Hungarian Urban Development] (Budapest: Márton Áron, 1996)
- Emese Lafferton, "Hysteria and Deviance in Fin-de-siècle Hungary," in *Rep-lika* special English issue 3 (1998), pp. 75-99.
- László Lakatos, "Az elfelejtett Hajnal István. Az íráskultúra és a kapitalizmus szelleme: Hajnal István 1933/34-es tanulmányai," [The Forgotten István Hajnal. Culture of Writing and the Spirit of Capitalism: István Hajnal's Studies from 1933-34] in *Medvetánc* (Vol 2-3 1982), pp. 305-19.
- László Lakatos, "Egy szociológus történész: Hajnal István," [A Sociologist Historian: István Hajnal] in *Tanulmányok a magyar szociológia történetéből* (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 1988), pp.1-69.
- László Lakatos, *Az élet és a formák. Hajnal István történelemszociológiája* [Life and Forms: István Hajnal's Sociology of History] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1996)
- Emma Léderer, *A magyar polgári történetírás rövid története* [The Short History of Hungarian Bourgeois Historiography] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1966)
- Paul Lendvai, *The Hungarians: A Thousand Years of Victory in Defeat* (Princeton University Press, 2003)
- L'ubomír Lipták, *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad: a történelemről és a történetírásról* [A Century Longer than Hundred Years: On History and Historiography] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)
- György Litván and László Szücs, eds., *A szociológia első magyar műhelye* vols. 1-2 [The First Hungarian Workshop of Sociology] (Bp. 1973)
- György Litván, *Magyar gondolat, szabad gondolat* [Hungarian Thought, Free Thought] (Budapest: Magvető, 1978)
- György Litván, ed. *The Hungarian Revolution of 1956: Reform, Revolt and Repression 1953-1963* (London - New York: Longman, 1996)
- György Litván, *Jászi Oszkár* [Oszkár Jászi] (Budapest: Osiris, 2003)
- Zsuzsa L. Nagy, *A haszonból élő kispolgár* [The Petit Bourgeois Living on Profit] (Debrecen: Debrecen University Press, 1997)
- Mária Ludassy, *Téveszméink eredete* [The Origins of Our Misconceptions] (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1991)
- Mária Ludassy, *A toleranciától a szabadságig. Anglia 300 éve egy eszme tükrében* [From Tolerance to Liberty: The 300 Years of England in the Mirror of an Idea] (Budapest: Kossuth, 1992)
- Mária Ludassy, *Fehér jakobinizmus. Charles Maurras és az Action Française* [White Jacobinism: Charles Maurras and the Action Française] (Budapest: Kávé Kiadó, 1999)

- Zoltán Magyar, *Szent László a magyar néphagyományban* [Saint Ladislaus in Hungarian Folklore] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Ferenc Makk, *Magyar külpolitika* [Hungarian Foreign Policy] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1993)
- Ferenc Makk, *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig* [From the Turul To the Double Cross] (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1998)
- Elemér Mályusz, *Magyar történettudomány* [Hungarian Historiography] (Budapest: Bolyai Akadémiai, 1942)
- Elemér Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Clerical Society in Medieval Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1971)
- Elemér Mályusz, *Népiségtörténet* [Ethnic History] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1994)
- Elemér Mályusz, *Magyarország története a felvilágosodás korában* [The History of Hungary in the Age of the Enlightenment] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002) (reprint)
- Elemér Mályusz, *A középkori Magyarország település- és nemzetiségpolitikája* [The Policy of Settlement and Nationality of Medieval Hungary] (Budapest: Lucidus, 2002)
- János Mazsu, *The Social History of the Hungarian Intelligentsia in the 'Long Nineteenth Century' 1825-1914* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 1996)
- Ambrus Miskolczy, *Eszmék és téveszmék. Kritikai esszék a román múlt és jelen vitás kérdéseit tárgyaló könyvekről* [Ideas and Misunderstandings. Critical Essays on Books Discussing the Debated Issues of Romanian Past and Present] (Budapest: ELTE BTK Román Filológiai Tanszék, 1994)
- Ambrus Miskolczy, *Lélek és titok. A „mioritikus tér” mítosza, avagy Lucian Blaga eszmevilágáról* [Soul and Secret: The Myth of 'Mioritic Space' or Essay on the Ideas of Lucian Blaga] (Budapest: Közép-Európa Intézet - Kortárs Kiadó, 1994)
- Ambrus Miskolczy, *Szellem és nemzet. Babits Mihály, Eckhardt Sándor, Szekfű Gyula és Zolnai Béla világáról* [Spirit and Nation. On the Worlds of Mihály Babits, Sándor Eckhardt, Gyula Szekfű and Béla Zolnai] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2001)
- Ambrus Miskolczy, *Határjárás a román-magyar közös múltban* [Roaming about the Borders in the Romanian-Hungarian Common Past] (Budapest: Lucidus, 2004)
- Judit Molnár, *Zsidósors 1944-ben az V. (szegedi) csendőrkörületben* [Jewish Fate in 1944 in the 5th (Szeged) Gendarmerie District] (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1995)
- Miklós Molnár, *A Concise History of Hungary* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Ilona Mona, *Schlachta Margit* [Margit Schlachta] (Budapest: Corvinus, 1997)
- István Monok, Noémi Németh, and Sándor Tonk, eds. *Erdélyi könyvesházak. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely* [Transylvanian libraries. 2. Kolozsvár, Marosvásárhely, Nagyenyed, Szászváros, Székelyudvarhely] (Szeged: Scriptorum, 1991)

- Balázs Nagy and Marcell Sebők, eds., ...*The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways...: Festschrift in Honor of János M. Bak* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999)
- Emil Niederhauser, *A történetírás története Kelet-Európában* [The History of Historiography in Eastern Europe] (Budapest: História- MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1995)
- Mária Ormos, "Jelző és történelem," [Adjective and History] in *Történelmi Szemle* 39 (Summer 1997), pp. 179-190.
- Mária Ormos, "Történelem és történetírás," [History and Historiography] in *Korunk* 11 (July 2000), pp. 4-11.
- Mária Ormos, *Egy magyar médiavezér: Kozma Miklós*, vols. 1-2 [A Hungarian media guru. Miklós Kozma] (Budapest: PolgART, 2001)
- Mária Ormos, *Hitler* (Budapest: T-Twins, 1994)
- István Orosz, Lajos Für and Pál Román, eds., *Magyarország agrártörténete. Agrártörténeti tanulmányok* [The Rural History of Hungary: Studies in Rural History] (Budapest: Mezőgazdasági, 1996)
- József Ö. Kovács, *Zsidók a Duna-Tisza között* [Jews in Between the Danube and the Tisza] (Kecskemét: Kecskeméti Lapok – Kecskemét Monográfia Szerkesztősége, 1996)
- Sándor Öze, "Bűneiért bünteti Isten a magyar népet." *Egy bibliai párhuzam vizsgálata a XVI. századi nyomtatott egyházi irodalom alapján* ['God punishes the Hungarian people for their sins.' An inquiry into a Biblical parallel on the basis of ecclesiastical literature printed in the 16th century] (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1991)
- Zsigmond Pál Pach, ed., *Magyarország története tíz kötetben* [History of Hungary in ten volumes] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976-1988)
- Judit Pál, *Procesul de urbanizare din scaunele secuiești în secolul al XIX-lea* [The Urbanization Process in the Szekler Districts in the 19th Century] (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1999)
- Mária Palasik, *A jogállamiság megteremtésének kísérlete és kudarca Magyarországon, 1944-1949* [The Attempt and Failure of Creating a Legal State in Hungary, 1944-1949] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2000)
- Mária Palasik, *Kovács Béla, 1908-1959* [Béla Kovács, 1908-1959] (Budapest: Occidental Press – Századvég, 2002)
- Géza Pálffy, *A tizenhatodik század története* [The History of the 16th Century] (Budapest: Pannonica, 2000)
- Géza Pálffy, *A császárváros védelmében. A győri főkapitányság története, 1526-1598* [In Defense of the Imperial City. The History of the Győr Captaincy, 1526-1598] (Győr: Győr-Moson-Sopron Megye Győri Levéltára, 1999)
- Imre Pászka, *Román eszmetörténet, 1866-1945. Önismeret és modernizáció a román gondolkodásban* [Romanian Intellectual History, 1866-1945. Self-Knowledge and Modernisation in Romanian Thought] (Budapest: Aetas-Századvég, 1994)
- János Pelle, *Az utolsó vérvádak* [The Last Blood Libels], (Budapest: Pelikán, 1995)

- János Pelle, *Jászi Oszkár* [Oszkár Jászi] (Budapest: Kairosz, 2001)
- Katalin Péter, "Női családfők Sárospatakon a 16. és 17. században," [Female Heads of Families in Sárospatak in the 16th and 17th Centuries] in *Századok* 123 (September – November, 1989), pp. 563-606.
- Katalin Péter, *Papok és nemesek* [Priests and Noblemen] (Budapest: Ráday Gyűjtemény, 1995)
- Katalin Péter, *Gyermek a kora újkori Magyarországon: "adott Isten hozzánk való szeretetéből... egy kis fraucimmerecskét nekünk"* [Children in Hungary in the Early-modern Period: 'God Has Given Us from His Love Towards Us a Small Frauzimmer'] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, Bp., 1996)
- Katalin Péter, *Beloved Children. History of Aristocratic Childhood in Hungary in the Early-modern Age* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2001)
- László Péter, ed., *Historians and the History of Transylvania* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992)
- György Péteri, "Születésnap ajándék Sztálinnak," [Birthday Present to Stalin] in *Századvég* 1 (1989), pp. 18-35.
- Áron Petneki, "Advenae et peregrini," in *Századok* 128 (March 1994), pp. 352-93.
- Andrea Pető, *Nőhistóriák* [Women's Histories] (Budapest: Seneca, 1998)
- Andrea Pető, *Hungarian Women in Politics 1945-1951* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2003)
- Andrea Pető, "Átvonuló hadsereg, maradandó trauma," [Army Marching Through, Trauma Enduring] in *Történelmi Szemle* 41 (Spring – Summer, 1999), pp. 85-109.
- Éva Pócs and Vilmos Voigt, eds., *Ősök, táltosok, szentek* [Ancestors, Shamans, Saints] (Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézete, 1998)
- Attila Pók, *A Huszadik Század körének történetfelfogása* [The Perception of History of the Circle of the Journal *Huszadik Század*] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1982)
- János Poór, ed., *József Hajnóczy* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998)
- János Pótó, "Harmadik nekifutásra," [For the Third Go] in *Történelmi Szemle* 36 (Spring – Summer, 1994), pp. 79-110.
- János Pótó, *Emlékművek, politika, közgondolkodás* [Monuments, Politics, Public Sphere] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989)
- János Pótó, *Az emlékeztetés helyei: emlékművek és politika* [Sites of Reminding: Monuments and Politics] (Budapest: Osiris, 2003)
- Ferenc Pölöskei, Jenő Gergely, Lajos Izsák, eds. *Magyarország története 1918-1990* [History of Hungary 1918-1990] (Budapest: Korona, 1995)
- Anikó Prepuk, *A zsidóság Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* [The Jews in Central and Eastern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries] (Debrecen: Csokonai, 1997)
- Pál Pritz, ed., *Bárdossy László a népbírótság előtt* [László Bárdossy in front of the People's Tribunal] (Budapest: Maecenas, 1991)

- Pál Pritz, "Történetírásunk egynémely problémájáról—különös tekintettel a posztmodernre," [On Some Certain Problems of Our Historical Writing—With Special Attention on the Postmodern] in *Múltunk* 48 (vol. 4 2003), pp. 246-279.
- Levente Püski, Lajos Timár, Tibor Valuch, eds., *Politika, gazdaság és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, Vols. 1-2. [Politics, Economy and Society in 20th Century Hungarian History] (Debrecen: KLTE Történelmi Intézet Új- és Legújabbkori Magyar Történelem Tanszéke, 1999)
- István Rácz, *Parasztok, hajdúk, civisek* [Peasants, Heyducks, Burghers] (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000)
- Erő Raffay, *A vajdaságtól a birodalomig: Az újkori Románia története* [From the Principalities to the Empire: The History of Modern Romania] (Szeged: JATE, 1989)
- Erő Raffay, *Magyar tragédia: Trianon 75 éve* [The Hungarian Tragedy: 75 Years of Trianon] (Budapest: Püski, 1995)
- János Rainer M., *Nagy Imre. Politikai életrajz 1896-1953* [Imre Nagy: Political Biography 1896-1953] Vol. 1 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996) 1953-1958 Vol. 2 (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1999)
- János Rainer M., *Az író helye* [The Author's Place] (Budapest: Magvető, 1990)
- János Rainer M., ed., *Múlt századi hétköznapiak: tanulmányok a Kádár-rendszer kialakulásának időszakából* [Everyday Life in the Last Century : Studies from the Period of the Formation of the Kádár-regime] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 2003)
- Vera Ránki, *Magyarok-zsidók-nacionalizmus* [Hungarians-Jews-Nationalism] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1999)
- István Rév, "In Mendacio Veritas," in *Representations* 35 (Summer, 1991), pp. 1-20.
- István Rév, "In Mendacio Veritas," in *2000* 5 (September 1994), pp. 51-61.
- István Rév, "Parallel Autopsies," in *Representations* 49 (Winter 1995), pp. 15-39.
- István Rév, *Retroactive justice: prehistory of post-communism* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005)
- István Rév, "Az atomizáció előnyei," [The Advantages of Being Atomized] in *Replika* 23-24 (December 1996), pp. 141-158.
- Sándor Révész, *Aczél és korunk* [Aczel and Our Age] (Budapest: Sik, 1997)
- Zoltán Ripp, *Örvenhat októbere és a hatalom* [1956 October and the Power] (Budapest: Napvilág, 1997)
- Zoltán Ripp, *1956. Forradalom és szabadságharc Magyarországon* [1956: Revolution and War of Independence in Hungary] (Budapest: Korona, 2001)
- Gergely Romsics, *Mítosz és emlékezet: A Habsburg Birodalom felbomlása az osztrák és a magyar politikai elit emlékirat-irodalmában* [Myth and Memory: The Dissolution of the Habsburg Empire in the Memoirs of the Austrian and Hungarian Political Elite] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2004)
- Ignác Romsics, ed., *Integrációs törekvések Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19-20. században* [Ambitions of Integration in Central and Eastern Europe in the 19-20th Centuries] (Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 1997)

- Ignác Romsics, *Bethlen István. Politikai életrajz* [István Bethlen: Political Biography] (Budapest : Magyarságkutató Intézet, 1991)
- Ignác Romsics, *Hungary in the 20th Century* (Budapest: Corvina – Osiris, 1999)
- Ignác Romsics, ed., *Magyarország és a nagyhatalmak a XX. században* [Hungary and the Great Powers in the 20th century] (Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 1997)
- Ignác Romsics, *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében* [Our Place and Destiny in the Danubian Basin] (Budapest: Osiris, 1996)
- Ignác Romsics, *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században* [Nation, Nationality and the State in East-Central and Southeast Europe in the 19-20th Centuries] (Budapest: Napvilág, 1998)
- Ignác Romsics, *Trianon és a magyar politikai gondolkodás, 1920-1953* [Trianon and the Hungarian Political Thought, 1920-1953] (Budapest: Osiris, 1998)
- Ignác Romsics, 'Az objektivitás mítosza és a mitizálás elfogadhatatlansága' [The Myth of Objectivity and the Unacceptability of Mythologization] in *Rubicon* (Vol. 10 2001 – Vol. 1 2002). pp. 4-8.
- Ignác Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században* [History of Hungary in the Twentieth Century] (Budapest: Osiris, 2000)
- Ignác Romsics, ed., *Mítoszok, legendák, tévhitek a 20. századi magyar történelemről* [Myths, Legends, Misbeliefs on 20th Century Hungarian History] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002)
- Ágnes R.Várkonyi, *Europica varietas—Hungarica varietas* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1994)
- Ágnes R.Várkonyi, *A királyi Magyarország* [Royal Hungary] (Budapest: Vince, 1999)
- Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Európa híres kertje: történeti ökológia tanulmányok Magyarországról* [The Famous Garden of Europe: Historical-Ecological Studies on Hungary] (Budapest: Orpheusz, 1993)
- Ágnes R.Várkonyi, *A tűzvész tanúi* [Witnesses of Fire] (Budapest: Liget Műhely Alapítvány, 1995)
- Csaba Sasfi, "Die politische Wende und die Geschichtswissenschaften in Ungarn," in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 1 (1991), pp. 103-108.
- Mária Schadt, *Feltörekvő dolgozó nő: nők az ötvenes években* [Ambitious Working Women: Women in the Fifties] (Pécs: Pro Pannonica, 2003)
- István Schlett, *A magyar politikai gondolkodás története* [The History of Hungarian Political Thought] (Budapest: Korona, 1996)
- Mária Schmidt, *Diktatúrák ördögszekerén. Válogatott tanulmányok* [On the Devil's Cart of Dictatorships: Selected Studies] (Budapest: Magvető, 1998)
- Katalin Sinkó and Árpád Mikó, eds., *Történelem—kép. Szemelvények a múlt és művészet kapcsolatából Magyarországon* [History-Image: Selected Examples of the Interplay between Past and Art in Hungary] (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 2000)

- András Sipos and Péter Sipos, eds., *Imrédy Béla a vádlottak padján* [Béla Imrédy in the Prisoner's Box] (Budapest: Osiris Budapest Főváros Levéltára, 1999)
- Gábor Sonkoly, *Erdély városai a XVIII-XIX. században* [The Cities of Transylvania in the Eighteenth-Nineteenth Century] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2001)
- Éva Ständeisky, "Antiszemita megmozdulások Magyarországon a koalíciós időszakban," [Anti-Semite Pogroms in Hungary in the Coalition Period] in *Századok* 126 (March 1992), pp. 284-308.
- Éva Ständeisky, *Az írók és a hatalom* [The Authors and the Power] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet, 1996)
- Tamás Stark, *Zsidóság a vészidőszakban és a felszabadulás után 1939-1955* [Jews During the Holocaust and after the Liberation 1939-1955] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1995)
- Tamás Stark, *Hungarian Jews During the Holocaust and after the World War II, 1939-1949* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000)
- Tamás Stark, *Magyarország második világháborús embervesztesége* [Hungary's Human Losses in World War II] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1989)
- Tamás Stark, *Hungary's Human Losses in World War II* (Uppsala: Centre for Multiethnic Research, 1995)
- Márton Szabó, Kiss Balázs, Boda Zsolt ed., *Szövegváltozatok a politikára: Nyelv, szimbólum, retorika, diskurzus* [Textual Variations on Politics: Language, Symbol, Rhetorics, Discourse] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó-Universitas, 2000)
- Márton Szabó, ed., *Szövegvalóság: Írások a szimbolikus és diszkurzív politikáról* [Textual Reality: Essays on Symbolic and Discursive Politics] (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1997)
- Márton Szabó, *Diszkurzív térben: Tanulmányok a politika nyelvéről és a politikai tudásról* [In Discursive Space: Studies on the Language of Politics and Political Knowledge] (Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1998)
- Miklós Szabó, *Múmiák öröksége* [The Legacy of Mummies] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1995)
- Miklós Szabó, *Az újkonzervativizmus és a jobboldali radikalizmus története (1867-1918)* [The History of Neo-Conservatism and Right-Wing Radicalism (1867-1918)] (Budapest : Új Mandátum, 2003)
- Róbert Szabó, 'Politikai propaganda és történelmi ünnep' [Political Propaganda and Historical Festival] in *Történelmi Szemle* 40 (Vol. 3-4 1998), pp. 215-227.
- Róbert Szabó, "Pártok, politikai propaganda, történelmi ünnepek Magyarországon 1945-1948," [Parties, Political Propaganda, Historical Festivals in Hungary 1945-1948] in *Sic itur ad astra* 6 (Vol. 2-4 1993), pp. 261-272.
- Ferenc Szakály, *Mezőváros és reformáció* [Market-Town and Reformation] (Budapest: Balassi, 1995)

- Attila Szakolczai and László Á. Varga, *A vidék forradalma, 1956* [The Revolution of the Countryside, 1956] (Budapest: 1956-os Intézet – Budapest Főváros Levéltára, 2003)
- László Szarka, *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés—Magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867-1918* [Slovak National Development—Hungary's Ethnic Minorities Policy 1867-1918] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1995)
- László Szarka, *Kisebbségi léthelyzetek—közösségi alternatívák: az etnikai csoportok helye a kelet-közép-európai nemzetállamokban* [Minority Life Conditions—Community Alternatives: The Place of Ethnic Groups in East-Central European Nation States] (Budapest: Lucidus, 2004)
- László Szarka, *Duna-táji dilemmák: nemzetiségi kisebbségek—kisebbségi politika a 20. századi Kelet-Közép-Európában* [Danubian Dilemmas: National Minorities and Minority Politics in 20th Century East-Central Europe] (Budapest: Ister Kiadó és Kulturális Szolgáltató Iroda, 1998)
- Zoltán Szász, *A románok története* [The History of Romanians] (Budapest: Bereményi, 1993)
- András Szekeres, ed., *A történész szerszámosládája* [The Toolkit of the Historian] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002)
- Katalin Szende, "A női munka a középkori gazdaságban," [Women's Work in Medieval Economy] in *Aetas* 10 (Vol. 1-2. 1995), pp. 179-94.
- Katalin Szende, "Craftsmen's Widows in Late Medieval Sopron," in *Women in Towns*, eds.: M. Hietala – L. Nilsson (Helsinki – Stockholm, 1999), pp. 13-24.
- Katalin Szende, *Otthon a városban (Társadalom és anyagi kultúra a középkori Sopronban, Pozsonyban és Eperjesen)* [Home in the Town: Society and Material Culture in Medieval Sopron, Pozsony and Eperjes] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2004)
- Károly Szerencsés, *Magyarország története a II. világháború után, 1945-1975* [History of Hungary after World War II, 1945-1975] (Budapest: Ikva, 1991)
- Károly Szerencsés, "Az ítélet: halál" ['The Sentence: Death'] (Budapest: Kairosz, 2002)
- Károly Szerencsés, *A nemzeti demokráciáért* [For National Democracy] (Pápa: Pápa Város Önkormányzata, 1997)
- Dorottya Szikra, "Az 1891. évi betegbiztosítási törvény végrehajtása," [The Execution of the 1891 Act on Health Insurance] in *Aetas* 19 (vol. 1 2004), pp. 31-48.
- Szabolcs Szita, *A zsidók üldöztetése Budapesten, 1944-45* [The Persecution of Jews in Budapest, 1944-45] (Budapest: Magyar Auschwitz Alapítvány – Holocaust Dokumentációs Központ, 1994)
- József Takáts, "Politikai beszédmodok a magyar 19. század elején (A keret)," [Political Discourses at the Beginning of the 19th Century in Hungary – the Framework] in *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* (Vol. 5-6 1998), pp. 668-686.

- Lajos Tímár, *Vidéki városlakók* [Urban Dwellers of the Countryside] (Budapest: Magvető, 1993)
- Béla Tomka, *Szociálpolitika a 20. századi Magyarországon európai perspektívában* [Social Policy in 20th Century Hungary in European Perspective] (Budapest: Századvég, 2003)
- Ágnes Tóth, *Telepítések Magyarországon 1945-1948 között* [Re-Settlements in Hungary between 1945 and 1948] (Kecskemét: Bács-Kiskun Megyei Önkormányzat Levéltára, 1993)
- Eszter Zsófia Tóth, 'Klió és az oral history' [Clio and Oral History] in *Múltunk* 45 (Vol. 3 2000), pp. 165-177.
- Eszter Zsófia Tóth, 'Mi lesz akkor, ha meggyökerezek? A vándorlás és a visszavándorlás megéléstörténetei munkásnők életútbeszéléseiben' ['What Happens If I Get Rooted? Stories of Migration in Worker Women's Life Narratives] in *Korall* 13 (September 2003), pp. 49-64.
- István György Tóth, *Jobbágys, hajdúk, deákok* [Serfs, Heyducks, Clerks] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1991)
- István György Tóth, *Literacy and Written Record in Early-modern Central Europe* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2000)
- István György Tóth, *Mivelhogy magad írást nem tudsz. Az írás térhódítása a művelődésben a koraiújkor Magyarországon.* [As You Yourself Cannot Write. The Expansion of Writing in Early-Modern Hungary] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1996)
- István György Tóth, *Relationes missionariorum de Hungaria et Transilvania (1627-1707)* (Roma – Budapest: Római Magyar Akadémia – Ráday Gyűjtemény – MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1994)
- Törvénytelen szocializmus. A Tényfeltáró Bizottság jelentése* [Illegal Socialism: The Report of the Commission for Revealing Fact] (Budapest: Zrínyi – Új Magyarország, 1991)
- Zsolt Trócsányi and Ambrus Miskolczy, *A fanariótáktól a Hohenzollernekig. Társadalmi hanyatlás és nemzeti felemelkedés a román történelemben.* [From the Phanariotes to the Hohenzollerns. Social Decline and National Development in Romanian History] (Budapest: ELTE BTK, 1992)
- Kinga S. Tüdős, *Erdélyi védőrendszerek a XV-XVIII. században: Háromszéki templomvárak* [Transylvanian Defense Systems in the 15-18th Centuries: Fortified Churches in the Háromszék Region] (Budapest: Püski, 1995)
- Gábor Tüskés and Éva Knapp, "A katakombaszentek tisztelete," [The Veneration of Catacomb Saints] in *Századok* 128 (January 1994), pp. 3-45.
- Tamás Ungvári, *Ahasvérus és Shylock* [Ahasverus and Shylock] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1999)
- Tamás Ungvári, *The 'Jewish Question' in Europe: The Case of Hungary* (Boulder: Columbia University Press, 2000)
- Krisztián Ungváry, *Budapest ostroma* [The Siege of Budapest] (Budapest: Corvina, 1998)
- Katalin Vadkerty, *A belső telepítések és a lakosságcsere* [Inner Settlements and the Population Exchange] (Pozsony – Bratislava: Kalligram, 1999)

- Tibor Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében* [Social History of Hungary in the Second Half of the 20th Century] (Budapest: Osiris, 2001)
- Tibor Valuch, ed., *Hatalom és társadalom a XX. századi magyar történelemben*, [Power and Society in 20th Century Hungarian History] (Budapest: Osiris, 1995)
- Steven Bela Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976)
- Zsuzsanna Varga, *Politika, paraszti érdekvéonyesítés és szövetkezetek Magyarországon 1956-1967* [Politics, Assertion of Peasant Interests and Co-Operatives in Hungary 1956-1967] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2001)
- Sándor Vári, 'Női hisztéria Budapesten az 1880-as években' [Women's Hysteria in Budapest in the 1880s] in *BUKSZ* 11 (Summer 1999), pp. 174-84.
- Béla Varjas, ed., *Irodalom és ideológia a 16-17. században*, [Literature and Ideology in the 16th and 17th Centuries] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987)
- István Vida, *Az állami-politikai vezető réteg összetétele az 1980-as évek elején* [The Composition of the State-Political Elite in the beginning of the 1980s] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1992)
- Gábor Vincze, 'Magyarellenes hecckampány Romániában' [Anti-Hungarian Defamation Campaign in Romania] in *Beszélő* 4 (Vol 7-8 1999), pp. 146-8.
- 'Vita a Bevezetés a társadalomtörténetbe című kötetéről' [Debate on the *Introduction to Social History*] in *Korall* 15-16 (May 2004), pp. 331-58.
- József Vonyó, *Gömbös Gyula és a jobboldali radikalizmus* [Gyula Gömbös and Right-Wing Radicalism] (Pécs: Pro Pannonia, 2001)
- Boldizsár Vörös, 'Mitikus hős és példakép. Lenin-kép a hazai általános iskolákban az 1940-es évek végétől 1953-ig' [Mythical Hero and Example: The Image of Lenin in Hungarian Primary Schools from the end of the 1940s until 1953] in *Mozgó Világ* 18 (1992, Vol. 2), pp. 14-27.
- Boldizsár Vörös, 'Az 1918-as magyar polgári demokratikus forradalom ábrázolása a Magyarországi Tanácsköztársaság oktatási anyagaiban' [The Representation of the Bourgeois Democratic Revolution of 1918 in the Educational Documents of the First Hungarian Soviet Republic] in *Fons* 6 (1999), pp. 327-336.
- Boldizsár Vörös, *"A múltat végképp eltörölni"? Történelmi személyiségek a magyarországi szociáldemokrata és kommunista propagandában 1890-1919* [Erasing the Past Forever? Historical Personalities in the Hungarian Social Democrat and Communist Propaganda 1890-1919] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2004)
- Éva Vörös, 'Kunmadaras' [Kunmadaras] in *Múlt és Jövő* 5 (April 1994), pp. 69-80.
- Károly Vörös, *Hétköznapiak a polgári Magyarországon* [Everyday Life in Modern Hungary] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1997)
- Pál Závada, *Kulákprés* [Pressing the Kulaks] (Budapest: Művelődéskutató Intézet, 1986)

-
- Ferenc Zemplényi, *Az európai udvari kultúra és a magyar irodalom* [European Court Culture and the Hungarian Literature] (Budapest: Universitas, 1998)
- Vera Zimányi, ed., *Óra, szablya, nyoszolya. Életmód és anyagi kultúra Magyarországon a 17-18. században* [Watch, Saber, Couch. Life-Style and Material Culture in Hungary in the 17 and 18th Centuries] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1994)
- Attila Zsoldos, *A szent király szabadjai* [The Saint King's Freemen] (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1999)

Maciej Górny

From the Splendid Past into the Unknown Future: Historical Studies in Poland after 1989

An overview on major debates on history/historical studies in Poland during the 1990s must, unfortunately, start by assuming the scarcity of methodological and factual discussions among contemporary Polish historians. Apart from the extensive debates on the memory of Communism and on various aspects of Polish–Jewish and Polish–German relations (as well as serial polemics between authors and reviewers of historical books), there is only very weak exchange of ideas, involving small groups of historians and rarely ‘monitored’ by the mass media. At the same time, many topics mentioned below had not been discussed until recently. Some of these are motifs of political life that do not properly belong to historiography. The discussion of the case of Jedwabne and that of the role of the Instytut Pamięci Narodowej [Institute of National Remembrance] started in 2000/2001, for instance, are still continuing. In the last paragraphs of the essay I will try to briefly analyze the topics of probable future debates in history.

A researcher who focuses on the development of Polish historiography after 1989 would probably find it hard to get a good grasp on the problem. With regard to the institutional field, he or she should notice that since the fall of Communism, the number of universities, including private enterprises—and, accordingly, the number of students—has grown rapidly. On closer inspection, however, he will discover, that the number of professors and university staff remains surprisingly stable. Some of the professors seem to vividly compete to break the world record in accumulating official posts, to the clear disadvantage of the quality of their work. Recent rankings of world universities prepared by Chinese researchers placed only two Polish universities among the world’s best 500 (the Warsaw and the Jagiellonian universities). If the

external observer examines Polish education more closely, he will notice that a large numbers of faculties, especially in provincial cities, have not caught up with the already established ones. Another manifestation of the conservatism of the Polish historical profession is the rather small mobility of historians between the biggest university cities: Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, Wrocław, Łódź, Lublin, Gdańsk. This situation leads to the forming of relatively small groups of researchers studying, working and lecturing at the same university or institute. All these problems are shared, at least to some extent, by the historical sciences.¹

With regard to research institutes one should mention that the unparalleled potential of the History Institute at the Polish Academy of Sciences (IHPAN) is far from being properly used for the education of history students. This centralized institution, very much unlike research institutes of a German type, primarily offers a second prestigious post for scholars. These scholars could profit and give benefits to their younger colleagues in smaller institutes with a thematic focus (such as the *Instytut Zachodni* in Poznań, which, initially with a markedly anti-German direction, studies the history and culture of Western areas). A new university-type institute, the Collegium Civitas, which employs IHPAN cadres, has just been set up; therefore, it is too early to characterize its impact on the historical landscape.

Meanwhile, a type of regional interdisciplinary institute has developed as a non-state and not fully professional enterprise. Among the NGOs doing historical research are Ośrodek Karta, which works on recent history and often uses the methodology of oral history and Wspólnota Kulturowa "Borussia," which deals with the history and culture of East Prussia and with Polish-German relations. These institutions rarely receive state support and are probably more acknowledged abroad than in Poland.

An external observer would probably have till recently quite a good opinion of the way Poland solved the problem of Communist secret police documents, handing them over to the *Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*. But if one looks at the Poles' opinion of the IPN, the picture of a successful *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* becomes problematic. After the elections to the Polish Parliament in September 2001, the IPN found itself attacked both from the right and the left sides of the Polish political scene. Some rightist journalists criticized the commitment to the case of Jedwabne (the massacre of the Jewish population of a provincial

town by the Polish majority when German troops invaded the Soviet Union). At the same time, many people (including professional historians) accused the IPN of being a rightist political organization created to search for a factual basis for anti-social-democratic propaganda and using public funds to achieve private political goals. Since the last elections (2005) IPN has been successfully turned into a political tool used by the right-wing side of the political scene. The IPN is also an object of the quite non-political critique of those historians who have to wait definitely too long for access to its archive. On the other hand, IPN did not avoid serious blunders, including the publication of lists of the secret files by a journalist, Bronisław Wildstein. It was followed by an ever-growing wave of new discoveries touching various parts of the society. One of the most striking aspects is the marked presence of clergymen among former secret police agents.

In connection with historical education and research institutions, the observer should focus on historical publications: journals and monographs. Here again, the first impression will be quite positive. Just like the number of books published, the number of periodicals containing historical articles has grown as well. At the same time, the number of research publications is much smaller than before 1989. Numerous periodicals do not appear regularly, and some of them seem to be published mostly due to the ambition of every university to have a historical journal. It is often stated that the number of published historical works is too high. One might contest this claim; nevertheless, it is true that many books are published (and sometimes written) negligently, without attempting to create or influence historical debates. Also, established scholars use university publishing houses to re-publish their collected articles, even if those have already lost their informational value.

Another important issue is that of the international contacts of Polish historical science. Polish historians were never isolated from their Western colleagues (except in the period between 1949 and 1956), and since 1989 international co-operation has ceased to meet any administrative obstacles. The review sections of the main historical journals are full of notes on works by foreign authors, some of whom also publish in Poland. A relatively small but intellectually strong group of foreign scholars work on the history of Poland and co-operate with their Polish colleagues. Historians like Klaus Zernack, Hans Henning Hahn, Rob-

ert Blobaum, Timothy Snyder, and Norman Davies (it is impossible to mention all of them here) play an important role in connecting Polish historical science with the rest of the world.

It would be much more difficult to prepare a comparable list of Polish historians whose work has recently been noticed and commented on in the West. The reception of new Polish historical publications is also far from satisfying. If we asked the foreign observer to mention names of Polish historians whose works, not only on the history of Poland, should simply be known because of their methodological import, he would mostly mention scholars who have unfortunately already deceased: Witold Kula, Aleksander Gieysztor, Tadeusz Mantuffel, Jerzy Topolski, Antoni Mączak, Marian Małowist etc. There are at least two possible explanations for this state of affairs. First: younger Polish historians don't have much to offer, and if they do, their works published in Polish are rarely translated. Second: it is natural that the new leaders of the Polish historical profession take some time to emerge. Both explanations may be at least partly true.

But we may give another answer as well, based on the analysis of current research topics. If we realize that Witold Kula, although frequently using Polish examples, described economic phenomena of the whole of East-Central Europe, that Małowist built his models of underdevelopment on comparisons between East-Central Europe and Africa, we may conclude that what gained them reputation was their ability to produce broad and fruitful comparisons—and this is hard to find in current Polish historical research. This does not mean, however, that Polish historians concentrate only on Polish history. On the contrary, numerous scholars deal with German, Russian, Ukrainian or all-European history, and works in world history also appear. One of the characteristic traces of Polish post-Communist historiography is the great attention paid to minorities/regional studies. Here we encounter the effects of the decentralization of historical research and the rediscovery of the complicated problems concerning the cohabitation of Poles and national minorities. Special attention is devoted to Polish–Jewish, Polish–German and Polish–Ukrainian relations. The interest in the history of East-Central Europe yields numerous publications by Polish and foreign authors (for example by Klaus Zernack, Yaroslav Hrytsak, Natalia Yakovenko). The research of the topic got institutionalized in

the form of the Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej (Institute of East-Central Europe) in Lublin. A number of comparative analyses were built on its basis, e.g., *Historia Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej* [History of East-Central Europe] (ed. by Jerzy Kłoczowski) and Norman Davies' and Roger Moorhouse's famous *Microcosmos* (2002), published simultaneously in Germany and in the UK.

Despite all these noble efforts, however, a certain lack of comparative interest prevails. Strict and narrow specialization has no interest in asking questions concerning possible influences or comparisons between the phenomena described. This is certainly not a typically Polish pitfall of historical research; but it sharply contrasts with the best achievements of Polish historiography in the Communist period.

The last problem is connected to the specificity of Polish historiography after 1956. It must be stressed that, despite the Communist interest in history as a legitimizing factor and the activities of censorship, Polish historiography did not fall into an intellectual crisis in the Communist period. In fact, almost all topics, with the significant exception of recent history, were 'de-politicized.' The latter branch of historiography gained its independence later, with the development of unofficial underground publishing.² But the quality of research in certain fields within recent history was high, independently of underground, emigrant and Western publications. For example, quite 'official' publications from the 1980s on Polish Marxist science (books by Barbara Fijałkowska, Piotr Hübner and Stanisław Bębenek) are still useful (although not so numerous).³ Even a superficial survey of Polish historical journals from the 1980s shows how little the official Marxist methodology was respected (which may be due to a specifically Polish indisposition to any methodology).⁴

Polish historiography was also commented on in the West. Already in the 1950s Oskar Halecki made witty and caustic comments on Polish historiography during the Historical Congress in Paris.⁵ *Kultura* and *Zeszyty Historyczne* edited by Jerzy Giedroyc focused on various aspects of life in Poland, including science.⁶ Foreign authors like Herbert Ludat, Klaus Zernack and Elisabeth Valkenier analyzed historiography in Poland through its dependence on the authorities in the 1950s.⁷ But the thaw in 1956 completely changed the picture as well as Western opinions on Polish historiography.

Klaus Zernack, who in the 1970s participated in the scientific project *Die Interdependenz von Geschichte und Politik in Osteuropa seit 1945*, pointed out the differences between Polish historiography on the one hand and Soviet and Czechoslovak historiography on the other. According to him, the lack of purges and generation conflict among Polish historians created an untypical situation. Historians who defined themselves as Marxists (but only if one asked them directly, Zernack claims) felt loyal to the scientific milieu, to abstract science, but not to the ideology or the authorities. Even formal decisions aiming at connecting Polish historiography to the Soviet model had no visible effect.⁸

Due to the relative open-mindedness of Polish historiography before 1989, the new political order primarily brought a thematic enrichment into the research of recent history. Issues like the Polish–Bolshevik war in 1920, the deportations of Polish civilians, Katyn and the Soviet policy regarding the Poles during World War II were examined immediately after the fall of Communism. In recent years, a new type of re-discovered history has emerged: a new debate has opened around the topics of Polish–Jewish relations during the war (e.g., Jedwabne) and the collaboration with Germans during the occupation. During this debate, the historical self-stereotypes of a suppressed and innocent Polish nation has been questioned.

The main improvement in contemporary research concerns the Communist period itself. From 1989 on many editions of sources have been published, and later on a strong wave of secondary literature on the People's Republic of Poland (PRL) appeared. Contemporary history is also the innovative force within Polish historiography. Although works on the Stalinist period quantitatively prevail, the later development (*regress?*) of Communism in Poland can offer several popular topics for historical research. Among these are the anti-intellectual and anti-Semitic campaign of 1968 as well as the conflict between the Church and Communist authorities culminating in the simultaneous celebrations of the Millennium of Christianity in Poland and the state-organized “1000 Years of Polish Statehood” (1966). An important feature of recent historical research is the over-representation of the young generation of historians born in the mid-1970s, whose memories of the Communist period are restricted to its bitter end.

1. ANALYSIS OF THE PRE-1989 SITUATION

From the beginnings of modern historiography, Polish historians were supposed to answer the question of possible reasons of “national slavery.” It was characteristic of the whole period of partitions that—excluding short periods of semi-independence and Galician autonomy from the 1860s—neither Polish universities nor other state institutions offered positions to be held by educated historians. At the same time, many of them actively participated in politics, representing a wide spectrum of ideas from socialist to conservative and—sometimes—popularizing them through their work.

The enlightened interpretation of national history stressed the role of strong leadership and criticized the anarchy of the gentry. Joachim Lelewel (1786–1861) and his intellectual heirs, representatives of romantic historiography, had quite different ideas. Lelewel not only published hundreds of sources for Polish history but also coined the so-called democratic interpretation of Polish history, in many respects similar to the ideas of Jules Michelet (and other romantic historians and ‘nation-builders,’ like František Palacký). Lelewel searched for democratic principles in ancient Slavic pre-history as well as in the republic of the nobles in the 15th–17th centuries. Apart from his scientific activities, he was a democratic politician whose aim was the restoration of the independence of the state through a European revolution.

Lelewel and his students monopolized Polish historiography till the 1860s, when a strong wave of conservative criticism represented by the so-called ‘Kracow school’ emerged. Józef Szujski (1835–1883), and—above all—Michał Bobrzyński (1849–1935) criticized the *liberum veto* and noble republicanism. Their interpretation of history was then attacked as pessimistic, and a new group of historians (the so-called ‘Warsaw school’) reinterpreted it in a radically different, ‘optimistic’ way.

In the independent state (1918–1939) there were finally no institutional obstacles to the development of historical studies. Nevertheless, the overlap between history and politics remained and the most prominent historians were seen through their political sympathies—Marceli Handelsman (1882–1945), Józef Feldman (1899–1946), Waclaw Tokarz (1873–1937) and Szymon Askenazy (1865–1935) on the left, Władysław Konopczyński (1880–1952), Waclaw Sobieski (1872–1935), Zygmunt Wojciechowski (1900–1955) on the right. Special attention

was paid to diplomatic history, though some Polish historians also dealt with social and economic issues (Franciszek Bujak, 1875–1953).

World War II was disastrous for the historical community (just as for the whole Polish intelligentsia). More than half of the active historians were killed, many institutions were ruined, archives were burnt down or removed to Germany or the Soviet Union. Polish professors of Wilno/Vilnius University and Lwów/Lviv University were executed or deported to remote parts of Russia. Survivors were to accommodate to the new circumstances, restore universities, archives, libraries and create new ones in Toruń (Thorn), Wrocław (Breslau), or Gdańsk (Danzig). Some Polish refugees to Western Europe decided not to return to the Communist-dominated country (from among the most prominent, one should mention Oskar Halecki).

The first period after the war, up to 1948, was devoted to the reconstruction of the institutional and personal basis of Polish historical science. In this respect, Tadeusz Manteuffel, the re-organizer of the Historical Faculty of Warsaw University and Stanisław Lorentz, first director of the National Museum, were especially active. In Poznań, Gdańsk, Szczecin, Olsztyn and Wrocław new Polish research institutes were founded (the biggest of which is the—still existing—*Instytut Zachodni* in Poznań, created by Zygmunt Wojciechowski). The new authorities supported the reconstruction.

At the same time, from the very first months of independence, political censorship was exercised in the case of scientific publications as well. Some communist intellectuals (Stefan Żółkiewski, Roman Werfel) insisted on strictly keeping to Lenin's formulation according to which history is the most political among the sciences. Nevertheless, the majority of Polish historians adhered to the ideal of the institutional autonomy of research. As far as matters of methodology and research themes were concerned, the first period was characterized by an increasing number of works in social and economical history—rather neglected in the inter-war period—and, at the same time, an immense number of analyses of Polish–German relations, mostly in a strongly anti-German tone. Books published by the *Instytut Zachodni* were prioritized. It should be stressed that even until 1948 this character of historical research was closely related to the trends of the communist propaganda of the time, using the German “card” to strengthen the legitimacy of the new rulers.

In Polish historiography, the period between 1949 and 1956 is usually characterized as Stalinism. The beginning of the period saw the condemnation of Władysław Gomułka, accused of “rightist-nationalist deviation.” With the changes in the *Politburo*, a new language of political propaganda was devised and authorities solemnly announced Action “N” (for “Nauka”—science). The first noticeable change was in the analysis of Polish–German relations: instead of the nationalist key a new, Marxist approach was proposed, and independent research institutes in western areas of Poland were liquidated or incorporated into the new, centralized structure of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Science (from 1953). An active group of Marxist historians openly announced the new era of Polish historiography: the era of historical materialism. In 1949 the Polish delegation refused to participate in the Paris Congress of Historical Science, while in 1951 two important conferences took place: the 1st Congress of Polish Science and the 1st Methodological Conference of Polish Historians. Both were meant to re-evaluate the historiographical tradition and popularize the new methodology. Especially the latter proved to have influence on the further development of historical research in Poland. In front of a Soviet delegation, an overwhelming majority of Polish historians pledged themselves to the use of Marxism as an interpretative tool. At the same time, the performance of Polish Stalinists (Żanna Kormanowa, Celina Bobińska, Roman Werfel, Witold Łukaszewicz) was severely (though discreetly) criticized by the Russian visitors. Their opinion most probably had an impact on the decision concerning the nomination for director of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences. The chosen person, Tadeusz Manteuffel, medievalist and veteran of the Polish–Bolshevik war (on the Polish side), successfully avoided serving the authorities and created an efficient network of scholars within the Institute.

One of the most important tasks of the Institute was to co-ordinate the publication of a new Marxist synthesis of national history. (This task was never fully completed). During the 1950s an attempt was made to prepare a new interpretation of the Polish past. According to this interpretation, there was almost no native progressive tradition: the whole course of Polish history, full of Polish–Russian conflicts and characterized by the omnipotence of the gentry and the importance of the Catholic Church, was deeply criticized. Among the brighter

moments of the past were the Polish Renaissance and Enlightenment, but even those with serious qualifications. Although Polish uprisings were progressive struggles for national and social freedom, historians, despite all their good will, could never omit the fact that these uprisings were against Russia. The inter-war period was naturally among those most heavily criticized.

From 1956 to 1989 Polish historians developed their *modus vivendi* with the government and the Party. This stage started with the critical revaluation of the 'errors and deviations' of the 'recent period' (to use the frequently reiterated euphemistic expressions). From among the most critical researchers one should mention Henryk Wereszycki (who characterized the Stalinist interpretation of Polish history as pessimistic) as well as prominent but non-Party scholars: Witold Kula and Tadeusz Manteuffel. During 1956–7, in the atmosphere of patriotic renewal and Polish 'socialism with a human face,' there was a short period of free speech, including the freedom of scientific speech. But as soon as Władysław Gomułka secured his position, censorship resumed its activity.

Nevertheless, from 1956 on there was no more pressure to use only one methodology, namely Marxist (in its Stalinist version). Scientific contacts with the West, suspended in the Stalinist period, were also restored. Fernand Braudel was a frequent visitor at the Warsaw Institute of History; it was primarily the '*Annales*' school that influenced elder and younger Polish historians. It was interpreted in various ways: while for Witold Kula it was an impulse to re-construct Marxist methodology, other historians simply ignored Marxism, creating a Polish version of the French school (Bronisław Geremek). It was approved as long as the principles of Polish–Soviet brotherhood were not violated. This limitation was almost omitted in the case of economic history, the history of law and jurisdiction, and social history. The last of these fields gradually won the interest of more and more Polish historians (Kula, Jerzy Jedlicki, Antoni Mączak, Maria Bogucka, Janina Leskiewiczowa, Feliks Tych, Janusz Żarnowski, Ryszarda Czepulis-Rastenis). The history of culture developed at a similar pace, with the very fruitful work of Bronisław Geremek, Janusz Tazbir, and Czesław Madajczyk. From the 1960s, the so-called 'Warsaw school' of intellectual history emerged with Leszek Kołakowski, Andrzej Walicki Bronisław Baczko and Jerzy Szacki, working on the border between history and philosophy.

It could be claimed that the level of publications was usually rising with the thematic branching of research. The popularization of history was probably the weakest part of Polish history production in the 1960s and the 1970s. This serious gap was filled by the books of Paweł Jasienica (Leon Lech Beynar, 1909–1970), especially his series covering medieval and early-modern history: *Polska Piastów* (The Poland of the Piasts), 1960; *Polska Jagiellonów* (The Poland of the Jagiellons), 1963; *Rzeczypospolita Obojga Narodów*, 3 vols. (Commonwealth of Both Nations), 1967–1973. Jasienica's impact on the formation of the popular interpretation of Polish history is hard to overestimate. His attitude towards the past was non-Marxist, traditional and progressive-patriotic—thus, optimistic.

Within the long period of the relatively peaceful work of Polish historians, the year 1968 represents a short, but important break. The anti-Semitic and anti-intellectual campaign organized by the authorities (characterized by public intellectual and composer Stefan Kisielewski as “the dictatorship of the noodles”) did not shake the historical community to the extent it affected philosophers or sociologists, but its impact, especially on the younger generation, was still perceptible. Many history students were released, some called up, some imprisoned (among them Adam Michnik, who joined other history graduates in prison—Jacek Kuroń and Karol Modzelewski). Some scholars who decided to support students, among others Witold Kula and Tadeusz Manteuffel, were also attacked. A disgusting campaign against Paweł Jasienica brought his death (1970) forward.

The involvement of Polish historians in politics visibly increased in the 1970s, when many of them participated in creating a democratic opposition. To the names mentioned already (Michnik, Kuroń and Modzelewski) one should add those of Leszek Moczulski, Aleksander Hall, Antoni Macierewicz, Bronisław Geremek, and Jerzy Jedlicki. The climax of their political activity was the Polish August in 1980, when students and scientists called for democratic change. Thanks to these persons, an immense number of *samizdat* historical publications, by Western, emigrant and domestic authors also appeared. In the months preceding the introduction of martial law these were sold openly on the streets of bigger cities.

The last decade of the Communist regime did not reduce the number of *samizdat* historical publications, nor the public distrust in the

official popularizations of contemporary history and the history of Polish–Russian relations. Nevertheless, it should be admitted that authorities under the leadership of general Wojciech Jaruzelski tried to return to the cultural politics of the first years of the post-war period. The last traces of Marxism were disappearing before the enormous wave of nationalism. In the 1980s even the—from a Communist point of view—most problematic heritage became acceptable object of official historical research: the figures of Józef Piłsudski and Roman Dmowski. Also, some very good works on the history of the inter-war period appeared (by Andrzej Garlicki, Jerzy Tomaszewski, and Roman Wapiński).

Finally, the development of Polish emigrant historiography should briefly be summarized. The biggest and most active society was in Great Britain. In the post-war period two Polish universities were established in London: the *Szkoła Nauk Politycznych i Społecznych* (School of Political and Social Sciences) and the *Polski Uniwersytet na Obczyźnie* (Polish University Abroad). In addition to these institutions, some new research institutes were also created: the Sikorski Institute in London, the Polish Scientific Society Abroad, the Józef Piłsudski Institute in New York, the Historical-Literary Society in Paris (the counterpart of the liberal-conservative emigrant society in the 19th century), and the Polish Historical Institute in Rome. The emigrant historical community published several periodicals: *The Polish Review*, *Antemurale*, *Zeszyty Historyczne*, *Teki Historyczne* (the majority of them still appear). To co-ordinate the work of Polish emigrant historical societies, the Polish Historical Society Abroad was created, which included most research institutions in Western Europe and North America. Among the most active and most important emigrant historians were Oskar Halecki (1891–1973), Stanisław Kościółkowski (1881–1960), Marian Kukiel (1885–1973), and Jan Kucharzewski (1876–1952). Some Polish historians worked at foreign universities, sometimes achieving noticeable success (a case in point is Piotr Wandycz).

2. REDEFINITION OF THE DISCIPLINE SINCE 1990: CORE THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

As it was already mentioned, the political turning point of 1989 did not cause a methodological or thematic earthquake in Polish historiography. The great attention paid to the martyrology of the nation does

not deserve the name of orientation, nor does the reinterpretation of Polish–Russian and Polish–German relations. After the fall of Communism, some main tendencies in the historiography of the 1970s and the 1980s were maintained.

One of the distinctive features of Polish post-war historiography was its ability to use the apparatus of sociology, whether it was based on Marxism or on the ‘Annales’ school. Post-89 historiography follows this path with regard to each major chronological unit. Medievalists like Maria Bogucka and Halina Manikowska continue the research of everyday life both in medieval Poland and Europe. Bogucka also works on the theory of the research of everyday life.⁹ In early-modern history, it is mostly the numerous works of Janusz Tazbir that continue the analysis of the *Weltanschauung* of the Polish *szlachta*. In the history of the 19th century, Jarosław Czubaty’s works on the mentality of Polish militaries offer very interesting insights from both a methodological and a factual points of view.¹⁰ In contemporary history, the interest in social history has the greatest influence on researchers of the PRL.¹¹

In nationalism studies, scholars like Joanna Kurczewska and Tomasz Kizwalter interpreted the Central European (primarily Polish) development of nationality along the lines of Ernest Gellner’s theory of the modernity of nations.¹²

Another methodological approach based on the developments of Polish pre-89 historiography is intellectual history. In his recent monograph, Ryszard Sitek went as far as affirming the existence of a distinctive ‘Warsaw school’ of the history of ideas, including Jerzy Jedlicki and Andrzej Walicki. Authors like Walicki, Jedlicki and Jerzy Szacki continue their research on 19th century intellectual debates. Jedlicki’s book *Jakiej cywilizacji Polacy potrzebują. Studia z dziejów idei w wyobraźni XIX wieku* (1st edition: 1988) was re-published in 2002 and translated into English in 1999. It is due to influence of the group of researchers in intellectual history (Jedlicki, Maciej Janowski, Walicki) that Polish intellectual and political trends are examined with a comparative method, with special attention devoted to the East-Central European region (an example is the very thorough book by Tomasz Stryjek on Ukrainian inter-war national ideology).¹³

Bronisław Baczko’s work could be placed somewhere in between the above-mentioned approaches. The basic thrust of his research is neither social history *sensu stricto* nor the analysis of the debates of the

most important intellectuals, but the “social imagery and ideas” present at all levels of society.¹⁴ A similar approach was taken with regard to the political culture of the Polish gentry.¹⁵

At the same time, various historians still use the most conservative method to characterize the development of (mostly Polish) political thought. Roman Wapiński’s synthesis of Polish political thought is the best example of this approach (according to the formula of short biographical notes followed by the authors’ ideas on nation and state, ending with their influence on others).¹⁶

With regard to methodological issues, it is striking that the only group of Polish researchers taking part in debates on post-modernism and deconstructionism were followers of Poznań theoretician Jerzy Topolski, who tried to build his own methodological approach on the basis of Marxism, deconstructionism and traditional historiography. In the field of the history of historiography, one may speak of a school of Łódź and Warsaw, with students of Marian Serejski, Andrzej Feliks Grabski, Rafał Stobiecki, Andrzej Wierzbicki and Zbigniew Romek. Their detailed studies provide a picture of the social and political circumstances of historical research.

Polish gender studies, on the border between literary science and history (and the margins of university structures) has produced some interesting publications (on 19th and 20th century history—these publications will be discussed in the related sections). The interest in the topic induces people to take sides on the issue of the status of women within the post-Communist societies, a subject of current political debate. The authors of the publications mentioned are mostly the adherents of the feminist movement. These features of Polish gender studies do not help conceptualize and deepen the methodological approach, though the methodological orientation of gender studies seems to be promising.

3. EVERYDAY LIFE AND THE SOCIAL IMAGINARY: MEDIEVAL AND EARLY-MODERN STUDIES

Concerning the Middle Ages, a considerable number of works on social stratification and urban culture was published. The interest in East-Central Europe, which is one of the most characteristic features of post-89 Polish historiography, also had an impact on medieval stud-

ies. Examples are the seminal book of Jerzy Kłoczowski (the analysis of the formation of church and state in the region) and the works of the current director of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Stanisław Bylina, on 15th century Czech history (concentrating on the Hussite movement).¹⁷ Among the most fruitful and interesting works (not only to medievalists) are those of Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Banaszkiewicz, who describe the rules of the creation of early mediaeval *fabulae*.¹⁸ The latter continues his attempts to use Georges Dumézil's theory of the influence between the social order and religious beliefs to the eldest Slavic and Polish chronicles. His ideas were critically reviewed by Czesław Deptuła in the 1980s. (The controversy concerned the authorship of stories about the legendary beginnings of Poland. Banaszkiewicz analyzed the chronicle of Gallus Anonimus as a mediator between us and the earlier tradition, whereas Deptuła claimed that the annalist was the author of the *fabula*.)¹⁹ Recently the debate was resumed by Paweł Żmudzki in *Przegląd Historyczny*, with critical remarks concerning both authors.²⁰ Apart from providing factual analyses of certain details of Deptuła's and Banaszkiewicz's books, Żmudzki expressed his doubts about the usefulness of Dumézil's "tripartitio."

Jacek Banaszkiewicz's approach can be perceived as more than a contribution to medieval studies. Highly praised and awarded with the most prestigious Clio award for Polish historical publications, his work questions strict and factographic research on chronicles. Banaszkiewicz interprets certain *fabulae*, which exist not only in the Polish tradition, but in many other traditions as well. Through these, he offers a picture of medieval "invented traditions."²¹ In order to illustrate the importance of this seemingly obvious idea, I will refer to the traditional tale of the first historically known Polish ruler, Mieszko. According to the tradition, young Mieszko was blind, but he got back his sight in a miraculous way. Although the story repeats the all-European motif of the hero who starts his career from the bottom to achieve the highest splendor, it was commonly referred to as providing factual information on Mieszko and as such was repeatedly quoted in textbooks.

In contrast, the chronicle of Wincenty Kadłubek, the source of Banaszkiewicz's analysis, was treated as a repertory of fantastic stories dealing with the legendary beginnings of the Polish state. Banaszkiewicz, by placing his tales in a broad comparative frame, gives them

more meaning and more sense. For his approach avoids both extremes: he refuses to treat the chronicles as historical sources *sensu stricto*, but he also denies that they are the mere work of their authors' fantasies.

In the field of early-modern history, the political culture of the *Rzeczpospolita* is the most visible, central topic of research. Along with Tazbir, such authors should be mentioned as Urszula Augustyniak, Edward Opaliński (a brilliant researcher of 18th-century Polish history), Łukasz Kądziela and the recently deceased Antoni Mączak (whose works on clientelism in early-modern Europe and Poland were just supplemented by a huge synthetic volume).²² Augustyniak leans towards the history of mentality and cultural history, whereas both Kądziela and Opaliński concentrate on the political ideology of the 16–18th centuries. After 1989 a swarm of publications concerning certain details of the political culture of the gentry appeared.²³ Here again, a broad interest in the subject of East-Central European relations can be noticed.²⁴ The foci of interest, however, are Polish–Lithuanian, –Ukrainian, –Prussian and –Belorussian relations (with the Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej in Lublin acting as publisher of many related publications).²⁵

4. THE SHAPING OF NATIONS

The long 19th century is the period of the formation of the nation, marked by problems of nation-building and partitions. The two problems are closely related to each other, as Tomasz Kizwalter brilliantly illustrated.²⁶ One of the chronologically first cases under discussion was the confederation of Targowica, a conservative and pro-Russian movement of nobles in 1793. In traditional Polish historiography from the late 18th century on, Targowica was seen as an unquestionable act of national treason. Łukasz Kądziela in several texts opened a new perspective on it, with reference to the evolution of the notions of patriotism and nation, and, on this basis, re-defining the image of Targowica.²⁷

The Polish political thought of the 19th century remains another popular topic. Apart from the already mentioned, methodologically rather conservative study of Roman Wapiński, several important analyses of various streams of political thought have been published.²⁸ This is one of the few questions which gave rise to professional debate on

the origin and true characteristics of 19th century Polish liberalism. The conservative idea of Polish–Russian settlement as well as the first democratic attempts to solve the “Polish question”²⁹ have remained crucial topics (as they already were during the 1980s). Apart from the literature related to these problems, a number of important 19th-century publications on Russia appeared, e.g., by de Custine and Henryk Kamieński, to mention only two names.³⁰ All these studies refer not only to *stricte* political debates, but also raise the question of modernization as it was closely related to political trends of the time.

Marginally related to this theme is the broad research concerning Poles deported to Russia during the whole 19th century, with most attention paid to the post-1864 *katorżnicy*. One of the most fruitful initiatives of the last decade, under the leadership of Wiktoria Śliwowska and financed by state institutions (*Komitet Badań Naukowych*), with the co-operation of many scholars from Russia and the post-Soviet states, aims at completing the data about Poles in Siberia and other Russian territories. The results of the research have already been partly published, and the project organizers will soon complete the preparation of databases about the deported.³¹ The research of Polish–Russian relations during the 19th century became possible only after Russian archives were at least partly opened. Researchers of the 19th century and of the Communist period are among the Polish historians most interested in this co-operation.

Several popular topics blur the traditional chronological division between 19th century history and contemporary history. Among these topics are Polish–Jewish relations and the history of Polish Jews. The works of members of ŻIH (*Żydowski Instytut Historyczny*—Jewish Historical Institute/Warsaw) and translations (e.g., Ezra Mendelsohn’s *The Jews of East Central Europe between the World Wars*, published in Polish translation in 1992) should be mentioned as well. Systematic research and the publication of synthetic works on Jewish history is organized by the *Centrum Badań i Nauczania Dziejów i Kultury Żydów w Polsce im. Mordechaja Anielewicza* (Mordechaj Anielewicz Center for the Research and Teaching of the History and Culture of Jews in Poland). The history of Polish Jews (and Polish anti-Semitism) is one of the popular topics attended by public interest, oscillating between anti- and philo-Semitism. Chasidism, assimilation, Zionism, the Holocaust, the pogrom in Kielce in 1946, Jewish participation in the introduction

of the Communist regime, and—more recently—the Polish massacre of Jews in Jedwabne in 1941 are part of this general thematic orientation of Polish historiography.³²

Another popular topic in which the histories of the 19th and the 20th centuries overlap is political and economic emigration. The majority of studies before 1989 concentrated on the political thought of Polish émigrés. Simultaneously with the decomposition of Stalinism, the interest of researchers shifted from social radicals towards liberal and conservative politicians (who had always been a topic for Polish historians in the West). Gradually, the economic reasons for emigration and the status of Polish émigrés as well as the integration or assimilation of Polish newcomers into other societies attracted more attention. The number of related works published is notable even today. One should also mention the publications of Polish emigrants and foreign researchers on the topic.³³

Gender studies also concentrates on 19th and 20th-century history. It belongs to the most innovative streams of historical science, as it broaches completely new questions and proposes brand new methodological and interpretative frames. The first achievement of Polish historians in this field was the re-discovery of the topics of native suffrage and the early feminist movement.³⁴ Today, the volume of secondary literature on various aspects of women's history is considerably growing.³⁵ Some of the prominent and popular researchers of the elder generation (e.g., Maria Janion) expressed their solidarity with the feminist history of culture and literature.³⁶ The topic also attracts the attention of historians *sensu stricto*, though the selections of studies on various aspects of the social position of women do not always offer interesting discoveries and interpretations.³⁷

Multiethnicity and multinational relations are among the topics that influenced almost every 'chronological unit' from medieval and early-modern history to the research of the Communist period. Institutionalized research, however, is centred on the post-1918 events. The non-governmental Karta Institute (the publisher of the periodical, *Karta*) deals both with the history of the German minority in Poland after 1945 and that of Polish-Ukrainian relations. Apart from these, the Karta organized a collection of data concerning Poles deported to Russia during the 20th century. In this respect, they represent the 'afterlife' of the project led by Wiktoria Śliwowska on 19th century

katorżnicy. Apart from the Karta, one should mention the Instytut Wschodni, working on Polish–Russian, –Belorussian and –Ukrainian relations in the 20th century as well as dozens of smaller societies, institutes and organizations, usually with a combined interest in regional history and multicultural and multiethnic cohabitation. Priority has been given to the Polish–Ukrainian and the Polish–German case. Clearly, in both fields, nationalist interpretations of the past gradually withdraw from historical narration. Polish historians (Włodzimierz Borodziej, Jerzy Kochanowski, Eugeniusz Misilo, Grzegorz Motyka and others) work on the most bitter parts of international relations: the *Vertreibung* of Germans, the prisons for displaced German citizens on the territory of former Nazi concentration camps, the displacement of Ukrainians by Action “Wisła” and the Polish–Ukrainian conflict in Wolhynia. With regard to the problem of the *Vertreibung* (the deportation of the German minority after 1945), several important historical initiatives could be mentioned. We shall refer to two of these: first, the project *Kompleks wypędzenia* run in 1995–1996 by Polish and German historians under the leadership of Artur Hajnicz³⁸; second, the bilingual edition of sources for the history of the German minority in Poland after 1945 (the editors are W. Borodziej and H. Lemberg; the work is in progress).³⁹

Regional history in its Polish version has strong ties with multiethnic studies, as those regions which are most popular among researchers are the ex-German western areas and the ex-Polish western areas of Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine. Several major initiatives, public and private institutes and journals deal with these ex-multinational regions. The Stowarzyszenie Wspólnota Kulturowa “Borussia” works on the history of Masuria and Polish–German relations as well as the situation of the German minority after 1945 (it is the publisher of the periodical *Borussia*). The *Ogólnopolski Klub Miłośników Litwy* works on the history of Polish–Lithuanian relations (it is the publisher of *Lithuania*). The development of new regional universities that publish their own historical periodicals generates more interest in the history of every big region of the country. The first Polish attempts to use the methodology of oral history were made in this field: by Kaja Kaźmierska, on the basis of interviews with Polish persons deported from Ukraine and Belarus; by Zofia Wóycicka, on Wieprz/Weepers, a village in Masuria, based on interviews with Polish, Ukrainian and German inhabitants of the

area as well as with German *Vertriebene* from Wieprz. One of the latest and most famous products of the growing interest in regional past is undoubtedly the book of Moorhouse and Davies entitled *Microcosmos*.⁴⁰

5. DEALING WITH A DIFFICULT PAST: THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

In the Communist period, contemporary history was the most sensitive to political manipulation and it is still the most controversial part of history. As will be described in detail in the next section, the 20th century history of Poland generates the majority of public and professional debates, being a source of political arguments in current public life. Among the most important research topics that appeared (or re-appeared) only after the fall of Communism are the Polish–Soviet war in 1920, the German and the Russian occupation (1939–1945), Polish–Ukrainian and Polish–Jewish relations in that period, and the history of PRL (which generated the widest and longest historical debate after 1989).

The Polish–Soviet war in 1920 was part of non-existing history during the whole 45-year period after 1945. Whereas in the Stalinist period it was referred to as a “fuss” of “adventurous and criminal aggression” against the Soviet Union, after 1956 it was simply covered up. The collapse of Communism created an opportunity to publish emigrant works and to prepare new publications about a part of Polish history Communist authorities hated most: the victory of Józef Piłsudski over Russians in the war of 1920. On the basis of research by military historians, the date of the Day of the Polish Army was officially changed from the anniversary of the battle of Lenino (where Polish units, allied with the Soviet Union, fought against the Germans) to August 15, the anniversary of the so-called “miracle” on the Wisła—a victorious battle against Tukhachevskiy.⁴¹ (Its counterpart, the Russian Day of National Unity in turn commemorates the victory over Polish intruders in the first half of the 17th century). As an aside, it is worth mentioning that the treatment of Russian prisoners produced grounds for constant attacks by the Communist-oriented Russian press against the stereotype of the Polish victim and the Russian butcher, prevailing in Polish social memory from the late 18th century until now. Simulta-

neously, another marginal issue has been raised: the fate of the Ukrainians who, after the end of the war, were placed in camps and then settled in the area of Hajnówka.

Immediately after the fall of Communism, deportations of Polish citizens to the Soviet Union from 1939 to 1941 and from 1945 to 1947 became the most popular topic, previously a 'gap,' in the history of Poland. The first wave of deportations before 1941 was primarily to Kazakhstan, where a group of Poles who didn't succeed in returning home either with the Polish Army, or after the amnesty in 1956, still survives. The second wave included members of underground organizations who, during the Soviet offensive in 1944, fought together with Russians, to be disarmed and deported immediately after defeating the Germans. An initiative of the Karta Institute, which in 1987 started collecting personal memories of deported people, contributes to the giant wave of attention to the topic. Just after 1989, a number of emigrant publications appeared in Poland, among them memoirs of Ola Watowa (*Wszystko co najważniejsze...* [Everything that matters...]), Aleksander Wat (*Mój wiek* [My century])—an interview with Czesław Miłosz, and Gustaw Herling-Grudziński (*Inny świat* [Another world]). Deportations were also topics of documentary and feature films as well as subjects of diplomatic negotiations between the governments of Poland and Russia.⁴²

In contrast to the last issue, Polish resistance during WWII was a popular topic, highly valued by official historiography and propaganda during the Communist times. At the same time, it was one of those themes which were most subject to manipulation. The focus of research was Communist resistance, and the powerful civic and military organization *Armia Krajowa* as well as the nationalist partisans were either neglected or used as examples of Communists and non-Communists joining forces (the latter, despite failures and weaknesses of leadership, being "patriotic soldiers" of the underground state). In the 1960s an attempt was made to include veterans of the non-Communist underground into the anti-Semitic and nationalist faction within the Party under the leadership of Mieczysław Moczar.

After 1989, along with the deportations of Polish inhabitants of areas occupied by the Soviet Union, considerable attention was paid to the history of the non-Communist underground movement during the war. The last years of the Communist regime already allowed the pub-

lication of works on *Armia Krajowa* or the Warsaw Uprising, though the openly anti-Communist part of the underground was still missing from among the research topics of Polish historians. At the same time, though publications are numerous and secure public interest (especially of the elder members of society), no serious synthesis of the problem has been written. Nevertheless, historians working on the initial period of the Communist regime are now able to use extensive material. Another general phenomenon that exceeds the limits of Polish historical science is an attempt at estimating the realistic number of victims of the biggest regional calamities in the region. It refers to the victims of death and concentration camps, deportation of Polish citizens to Soviet Union as well as to the German victims of the escape and deportations 1945–1950. In all above mentioned cases the newly established numbers are smaller than previously stated.

6. FROM A MINEFIELD TO A RESEARCH AREA: THE HISTORY OF PRL

The opening of archives created an opportunity to study the political and social history of the Communist period. The Archive of New Acts (*Archiwum Akt Nowych*) was entrusted with the documents of PZPR. Also, access to the archives of the former Soviet Union ceased to be completely impossible. Polish historians were given access to archival resources in the former GDR.⁴³ From 1989 on, many editions of sources have appeared. Later, a considerable amount of secondary literature on PRL was published (examples are the series “*W krainie PRL/W krainie KDL*” on the social and intellectual history of Communist Poland and works on the peasantry’s attitude towards Communism). Contemporary history is also the innovative force within Polish historiography. In connection with this, a study on gossip in the Stalinist period and the analysis of the sounds of Warsaw in the 1950s may be mentioned.⁴⁴

One of the popular topics of research on the Communist period is the history of historiography. Although the popularity of this theme cannot be compared to that of its counterpart concerning the GDR, it is considerably stronger than in other post-Communist countries.

Although works on the Stalinist period quantitatively prevail, the later development (regress?) of Communism in Poland can offer several popular topics for historical research. Among these are the anti-

intellectual and anti-Semitic campaign of 1968 as well as the conflict between the Church and Communist authorities culminating in the simultaneous celebrations of the Millennium of Christianity in Poland and the state-organized "1000 Years of Polish Statehood" (1966). Recently some attention has been paid to the Polish participation in the intervention in Czechoslovakia in August 1968.⁴⁵

The latest period of Communist rule is currently intensely researched and analyzed; however, surprisingly, it does not prevail in studies of the Communist period. The reason may be the 30-year inaccessibility of archives (which is, however, not an unbreakable rule). A historian dealing with the 1970s and 1980s cannot restrict his factual basis to information related to the Communist Party, as sometimes happens to his colleagues working on the Stalinist period.

7. PUBLIC AND ACADEMIC DEBATES

As it was already mentioned, the activity of the Polish professional community seems to be characterized by a scarcity of historical debates. The topics below belong to the most politicized and instrumentalized stream of public life: the all-post-Communist debate on the nature and consequences of the native 'people's republics,' the case of the Jedwabne massacre, and the currently ongoing debate on the funding and role of the *Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*. These subjects provide historical arguments to be used in less sophisticated political quarrels rather than in high-level public debates. This makes it easy to understand why the latest Walser-Bubis debate in Germany was described and commented on with the envy of a country that didn't have its own *Historikerstreit*.⁴⁶ Recently, during the debate on the memory politics of the current rightist government, historical topics massively appeared in the public sphere but this debate runs mostly outside the professional community.

Soon after the fall of the Communist regime, Polish historians and non-professionals opened the question of the 'heritage' of the People's Republic of Poland (PRL). In 1990, a cycle of articles under the common title "The balance of 45 years" appeared in *Polityka*,⁴⁷ to be soon followed by similar cycles in *Tygodnik Powszechny*⁴⁸ (1992/3 and 1994), *Mysł Socjaldemokratyczna* (1993), and *Norwa Res Publica*⁴⁹ (1993). Apart from these organized discussions, lots of separate articles, written both by historians and politicians, appeared in almost every journal. It

didn't take long to transfer the popular topic into historical journals as well as other scientific publications. The overwhelming majority of the publications selected in the bibliographic section refer to the subject of the Communist regime in Poland.

Attempts to characterize the debate of historians have been published from the second half of the 1990s.⁵⁰ Making use of these attempts, I will try to briefly present the main topics of the debate. The most controversial feature of the PRL seems to be its political character, namely its independence or the lack of it. The various descriptions of the political status of the PRL oscillated between the dominance of the Soviet occupation and limited independence with the exception of the Stalinist period (1948–1956). It should be mentioned that the attitudes of the participants of the debate were closely related to their political stances (from the rightist position of *Tygodnik Solidarność*⁵¹ to the opposite position of the theoretical journal of the social-democratic post-Communist party, *Mysł Socjaldemokratyczna*). To some extent, similar traces of political commitment are also visible in the contributions of professional historians. Gradually, the more flexible interpretations of the PRL prevailed and its simplistic characterization as determined by the occupation was relegated to the extreme of political thinking.

Another aspect of the same question was whether the situation in Poland could have taken a different turn in 1945. It was often argued that the only alternative solution of the political status of the PRL would have been its incorporation into the Soviet Union. A similar question is whether the martial law of 1981 was a preventive step that rescued Poland from Soviet military intervention. If so, the role of the Polish Communists would have to be judged much more generously than before. Unfortunately, answering such questions lies far beyond what is possible for historians—it would be an example of counter-factual history.

It was often stated that the creation of Communist Poland solved old social and national problems which could not have been solved under different conditions. The Communist regime is said to have opened the way to the social promotion of the peasantry and the working class. At the same time, it is a fact that the most serious political and social riots against Communism in Poland were organized by the lowest social strata. The Polish peasantry retained its critical attitude towards Communists much longer than the Polish intelligentsia. Also, it

is still too early to decisively characterize social promotion in Communist Poland. Some historians (e.g., Andrzej Paczkowski) express irritation with the attempts of post-Communists to characterize the political system as the main force behind rapid urbanization and social progress. On the contrary, Paczkowski claims, Communism was the brake of economic growth; the European countries that avoided the fate of being part of the Soviet block achieved much more in comparison with where they started from in the inter-war period. (Spain is used as an example of a state that was culturally, socially and economically similar to the inter-war Poland. This comparison is, by the way, deeply rooted in the tradition of Polish historiography, especially in the work of Joachim Lelewel, who tried to compare these two Catholic countries.)

As related to the last topic, we should mention the popular notion of *Homo sovieticus*. Józef Tischner (1931–2000) gave a philosophical and social description of this type of man as deprived of traditional values and ‘sovieticized.’ This part of the debate on Communism is about the moral meaning of rapid social change in the PRL, namely the deconstruction of social order and traditional communities, the promotion of most cynical people, and taking away national history, traditional and religious values. Nowadays the notion and the people it designates seem to return to the mainstream of social debates. *Homo sovieticus* may prove to be one of the tools to describe the decline of the traditional political representatives of the intelligentsia (Unia Wolności) and the growth of radical, populist, anti-European and nationalist movements (*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość*, *Samoobrona* and *Liga Polskich Rodzin*).

The next point in the debate on the heritage of Communism is economy. With regard to this, there are two main positions: the first stresses the immense modernization catalyzed by the Communist regime, an effort that changed Poland from a rural state into an industrial one. The adherents of the opposite opinion refer to the overestimation of heavy industry, and, as an ultimate argument, to the ambiguous results of Communist modernization: in statistical terms, in the inter-war period, Poland was exactly as behind in comparison with Western Europe as industrialized post-Communist Poland in 1989. The question of the economic (under) development of the PRL often led to another theoretical debate: should we use the term ‘socialism’ when referring to the political and economic system of the PRL? If so, what kind of socialism?

One of the most politically-oriented parts of that debate referred to the role played by left-wing intellectuals who went from supporting the Stalinist regime to participation in the democratic opposition. Several 'historical prosecutors' published lustratory books, especially on those artists and intellectuals who were or still are active in public life. This feature makes such publications more informative with regard to politics than with regard to history. As a response to this kind of interpretation of history, a wave of positive valuations of the role of intellectuals in the 1950s were finally accompanied by more objective studies.⁵²

The last sub-debate concerning the heritage of Communism revolves around the question of totalitarianism. It is still unclear and controversial whether and to what extent this term is useful in the description of Communist rule in Poland. Some researchers (an example is Andrzej Walicki) deny the very existence of totalitarianism in Poland, claiming that only in the period of Stalinism could we find any traces of attempts to create a totalitarian system. The PRL was, according to Walicki, an authoritarian state. This idea seems to be more widespread among the most prominent historians (Walicki, Krystyna Kersten), though Andrzej Paczkowski proposed a radically different interpretation of the Communist political system. In his opinion, the Stalinist period was an introduction to the totalitarian rule, established after 1956.

The heritage of the Communist regime remains heavily contested. During the rule of the the post-Communist *Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej*, the funeral of the one-time first secretary Edward Gierek (in 2001) and the naming of several schools and streets after him have indicated the tendency of tentative re-evaluation. So far, however, there has been no serious scientific attempt on the part of post-Communists at a wholesale positive re-valuation of PRL. On the contrary, the neo-conservative backlash under the domination of the ruling party of Jarosław and Lech Kaczyński (PiS) radically cut any public debate on the nature of the Communist rule, replacing it with the permanent preoccupation with secret police files. The Communist period as a whole is now officially perceived as an "occupation", deprived of any nuances.

A short book by Jan Tomasz Gross *Sąsiedzi* (The Neighbours), published in 2000 by a small, provincial publishing house and—several months later—in English translation in New York opened a wide dis-

cussion, led mostly by professional historians.⁵³ The book describes the massacre of Jews that took place in Jedwabne, a village near Łomża, in 1941. The most striking feature of the event is that (according to Gross) it was organized and led by Polish inhabitants of Jedwabne. An open meeting was organized by Jerzy Jedlicki in the History Department of the Polish Academy of Science in Warsaw, attended by an audience of nearly 200 people, including most prominent contemporary historians, the cultural journalists of *Gazeta Wyborcza* as well as members of the Jewish Historical Institute of Warsaw University and the legendary hero of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto in 1943, Marek Edelman. From this open discussion onwards, many participants shared the same opinions concerning several main points. First, Jan Tomasz Gross's book met serious methodological critique based on the statement that the accusation against the Polish inhabitants of Jedwabne had insufficient factual background. It was often stated (and I must admit that I share this opinion) that Gross' book is not convincing. Historians like Jerzy Eisler or Tomasz Szarota pointed out that its tone is that of political accusation rather than of scientific work. At the same time, concrete remarks concerning the events described by Jan Tomasz Gross were restricted to details and did not change the essence of his publication, the thesis that the massacre was committed not by German soldiers but by Polish peasants.

In the debate in the History Department of PAN as well as in the first articles in *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*, another important problem was raised. Jerzy Jedlicki was the first to draw attention to the shameful indifference of Polish historians working on WWII with regard to the events in Jedwabne. The book by Gross was not based on any newly discovered sources. On the contrary, it used documents which had been known to historians for half a century. They were stored in the archives of the Jewish Historical Institute and even—though sporadically—used in some publications by its employees.

The debate on Jedwabne is still a fresh issue, engaging not only historians but also politicians (President Aleksander Kwaśniewski officially apologized to the Jewish community for the crime in 2001). It was also one of the most important issues examined by the Institute of National Remembrance. The result of the investigation, announced in July 2002, is that a group of about 40 Polish inhabitants of Jedwabne had a dominant role in the massacre. After the publication of huge

documentary volumes prepared by the IPN, Jedwabne seemed to lose its attractiveness as a topic of debate.⁵⁴

The moment the most hysterical reactions to the Jedwabne debate abated, another attempt was made at re-formulating the heroic self-stereotype. In 2002, Anetta Rybicka, a young historian, published a book on the *Instytut Niemieckiej Pracy Wschodniej*—a semi-scientific enterprise organized by German authorities in the occupied Cracow during the war. Some of the professors at the Jagellonian University (shut down by the occupants) worked for the institute, co-operating in theoretical research on the future reconstruction of East-Central Europe according to Nazi plans.⁵⁵ Based on Rybicka's book, a scandalous article was published in the weekly *Wprost*, which resulted in a protest on the part of officials of the Cracow University. The rector of UJ drew attention to the well-known fact that many of the professors working for the Institute were active in the underground movement and that the questions raised in the book and the article sully the glorious past of the Cracow University. So far the culmination of the debate has been an official announcement concerning the attempt to withdraw the doctorate of Anetta Rybicka, made by the rector of UJ.

The hysterical reaction of the Cracow historical community is hard to explain. Though *Wprost* gradually turns into popular literature, Rybicka's book is a solid scientific work containing no groundless accusations or out-of-date patriotic dogmatism. The whole question may be seen as an addendum to the Jedwabne debate, also with regard to public reactions. In 2001, the liberal press strongly criticized the conservative and sometimes nationalist statements of the inhabitants of the small and provincial Jedwabne. The reaction of the Cracow professors puts the whole issue in a new light.

The next issue is probably the most 'political' on the list of historical debates. As it was mentioned above, the close examination of the events in Jedwabne was conducted by the *Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*, a state institution consisting of three units: a research unit, an archival unit and a public educational unit. The IPN took over confidential archives of the Communist secret police, and makes them accessible to both historians and citizens interested in the content of their personal files. In this respect, it is similar to the German Gauck Institute. Besides, the IPN prepares documentation for the criminal processes of Stalinist functionaries. The last unit within the structure of the IPN

deals with education: it publishes documents, organizes historical exhibitions and conferences.

After the elections in September 2001, the IPN found itself attacked both from the right and from the left side of the Polish political scene. Some rightist journalists criticized its commitment to the case of Jedwabne. At the same time, many people (including professional historians, such as Janusz Żarnowski) accused the IPN of being a rightist political organization created to find factual basis for anti-social-democratic propaganda and of using public funds to achieve private political goals. The strong sentiments about the Communist times (especially the Gierek-era) harnessed by the researchers of IPN make many leftist politicians critical of their examination of Communist crimes and social resistance to the regime.

The first weeks of 2005 brought a renewal of the debate on lustration. Extreme right parties demanded access to all the documents of the Communist secret police. The former democratic opposition became divided along new lines: some dissidents supported this initiative, while some claimed that this type of historical source could not be treated as satisfactory information on people's behavior, that it was not trustworthy and that it was unfair to use it in political fight. The IPN tried to prevent the abuse of secret police archives by reducing the access of persons suspected of intending to use files for their political purposes. Meanwhile, the former directorate of the Institute was replaced and the change of director was followed by a purge in all central positions. The new head of the office, Jarosław Kurtyka, seems to act along the lines of the current ruling circles and the group of young researchers formed in IPN (Sławomir Cenckiewicz, Piotr Gontarczyk) shapes the current political debate around the secret police acts. It seems that the nearest future of the IPN is secured. It belongs to the richest state institutions and it also enjoys the highest respect of the ruling party and the rightist public. For the same reasons, the long-term prospects of the IPN are questionable, as the institution meets strong criticism from the political adversaries of the government.

An interesting example of a small-scale historical debate in the most prominent Polish historical journal *Kwartalnik Historyczny* was the exchange between Henryk Słoczyński, historian from Cracow and Andrzej Wierzbicki, Warsaw historian of historiography. It re-opened an old debate between the conservative historiography of 19th cen-

tury Galicia and both the romantic historiography of Joachim Lelewel and the positivistic ideas of the Warsaw historical school. Śloczyński argued that the Cracow conservatives were criticized and condemned not only by their more 'progressive' contemporaries but also by Communist historiography, which was said to be especially hostile towards the Cracow school. Wierzbicki questioned the last assumption, pointing out that Polish Communist historiography not only criticized Szujski, Kalinka or Bobrzyński, but also used parts of their historiography in its own theoretical attempts. Unfortunately, the promising exchange of ideas seems to have finished with the last answer of Wierzbicki.

Most recently, a new political-historical debate started over the place and final shape of the educational centre devoted to the commemoration of deportations. Although it is too early to characterize the outcomes of that debate, the most visible aspects can be briefly mentioned. The initial proposal of Erika Steinbach was to create a museum in Berlin for the Germans deported from Poland and Czechoslovakia. The Polish reactions were sceptical, due to the person of the initiator (Erica Steinbach, as the leader of the *Vertriebene*, supports attempts to reclaim territories taken over from Germany by Poland and Czechoslovakia in 1945).

In *Gazeta Wyborcza*, Adam Michnik and Adam Krzemiński proposed to turn this German initiative into an all-European centre of deportations in Wrocław, a city which is part of both the German and the Czech cultural heritage. (Its current inhabitants are Poles deported from Lwów/Lviv and Ukrainians deported from south-east Poland.) Several critical opinions were heard from both—Polish and German—sides, but the SPD and the German government supported the enrichment of the educational role of the centre. A third position rejects the idea of a *Vertreibungszentrum*, as it can easily be turned into a tool of German nationalist self-justification (for instance Hans Henning Hahn vehemently supports this point).

The new German coalition government officially supports the idea to create a commemoration center in Berlin roughly along the lines of Steinbach's idea, which—in the meantime—has been presented in the form of a sample-exhibition in Berlin. Surprisingly, the Polish authorities and rightist intellectuals seemingly ignore this fact and do not follow the previous Polish statements.

On the whole, 'memory politics' has been the most debated history-related topic of the last years. Detailed analysis of this debate lies far beyond the competence of the author, nevertheless a short overview of the most significant trends has to be included. The very notion of memory politics (or historical politics, 'polityka historyczna') is an idea of rightist intellectuals. During the electoral campaign in 2004 the *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* party included this concept into its cultural program. The main intellectual supporters of the idea (Dariusz Gawin, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Tomasz Merta, Marek A. Cichocki, Kazimierz M. Ujazdowski) stress the nation's need of uniting values and search for them in the national history, treated exclusively as a storage of patriotism. One of the popular arguments of these 'memory politicians' is that the current re-nationalization of the German historical memory needs to be countered by the united front of the Polish society since any critique of Polish behavior (i.e. during the post-1945 deportations of Germans) yields ammunition to the enemies of the Polish state.

The best embodiment of 'memory politics' is beyond doubt the Warsaw Uprising Museum opened by Lech Kaczyński (then mayor of Warsaw) in 2004. The Museum's exhibition deserves praise for its high technical level. It plays also an important role by connecting the eldest generation with the schoolchildren who can visualize the uprising in direct contact with sound, images and testimonies. However, critiques of the exhibition focused not on these features of the Museum but on the missing parts, namely the exclusion of the most important post-war Polish debate on the sense and consequences of the Warsaw Uprising. The majority of participants in this debate, including the combatants, shared the opinion that the uprising was a hopeless and tragic military effort without any chance to succeed.

The 'memory politics' promoted by the current government met strong opposition from members of the liberal intelligentsia (Jerzy Jedlicki, Marcin Król, Robert Traba, Anna Wolff-Powęska), who were pointing at its intellectual misery and short-sightedness. The image of Europe as a battlefield of nations certainly does not satisfy every taste and there is a fear that 'memory politics' in practice would entail nothing but sheer political propaganda. All these critical voices seem to hit the mark, moreover they seem to be the first serious attempts at theoretically assessing the issue of memory politics, since its creators prefer

to define themselves negatively, by rejecting post-1989 dealings with the national past.

The last debate I would like to mention started in 2001, with the critique of Maciej Janowski's book *Polska myśl liberalna do 1918 roku*. The ideas of Janowski were fundamentally criticized by young historian Nikodem Bończa-Tomaszewski (student of Tomasz Kizwalter). Bończa refuses to apply the adjective 'liberal' to the political and social thinkers addressed by Janowski. In his articles in *Fronda* and *Kwartalnik Historyczny* Bończa associated Janowski with other representatives of the so-called "liberal school," who, according to the young historian, invent ideas completely alien to the Polish historical tradition. The answer by Maciej Janowski was published in the next issue of *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. The Polish Academy of Sciences organized a meeting of the contributors to this historical debate, which took place in February 2002.

In one particular respect, the exchange between Janowski and Bończa may be seen as the forerunner of a certain type of historical debate characteristic of Central European countries before joining the European Union. The tensions between *Sonderweg* conceptions, so popular in the whole region, and the attempt to re-frame native history according to commonly applied Western categories (such as 'liberalism' in the previous example) appear in connection with other topics as well.

Strange as it may seem, the publication of the Polish version of "The black book of Communism" didn't open wider discussion. It may be understood as an effect of the wider access to *samizdat* literature than in other Communist countries and of the anti-Communist (understood also as anti-Russian) resentment in the PRL. Hobsbawm's *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914–1991* met with the same lack of interest. One of the few Polish reactions was a critical review by Krzysztof Pomian published in *Gazeta Wyborcza* in 2000, and, recently in the book *Oblicza dwudziestego wieku*.

If one tried to foresee the topics of future historical debates, one would probably mention the question of historical textbooks for *gimnazjum* (middle-level schools for children between 12 and 14). The system of state control over the quality of textbooks proved to be inefficient (according to the regulations, it is the editor who chooses the reviewer from a long list of approved historians, and it is also the editor who pays the reviewer; no wonder that no single example of a non-

approved textbook has become known to the public). Eventually, the Ministry of Education proposed that the state should co-finance one (as it was stated, “the best”) textbook to avoid chaos on the educational market. But, after the prompt critical reactions of publishers and teachers, the idea was put aside. Another issue related to history textbooks is that of historical narratives for children. For almost two years, the society *Otwarta Rzeczpospolita* has monitored textbooks from this point of view, trying to create a database of school-books with information for teachers concerning the editorial, factual and didactic level of books as well as their attitudes towards nationalism, national traditions, anti-Semitism and multinational relations.⁵⁶ Another factor determining the future of textbooks is the fact that many professional historians write and comment on textbooks, which is visible in official bibliographies of faculties and institutes.

8. THE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY: INSTITUTIONS, ASSOCIATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

To characterize the educational situation of Polish historical science, one should realize that while the number of universities is rising, the number of those who are unemployed with a higher-education degree is also rising. History does not offer marketable skills to its students. At the same time, it is quite probable that—at least in big university cities—history faculties offer better education than other, especially philology faculties. A considerable number of highly qualified researchers in history still work at universities, whereas philologists often go into business or find jobs in lower education. It is also worth mentioning that some private universities provide high-level history education. As a characteristic example, the College of Pułtusk could be mentioned, run by historians from the Historical Institute of Warsaw University.

Polish state universities are obliged to provide their students with free education. It is impossible to survive, however, on governmental subsidies. The effect of this situation is the incredibly high number of extra-mural and evening students, who pay for their education. At the biggest state universities, the average of paying students has achieved 50 percent. A subject of permanent controversies in Polish science and politics is whether this state is constitutionally acceptable or not. Paradoxically, such doubts do not arise in connection with private universi-

ties. In the case of the latter, another factor creates further problems: the quality of education does not always fulfill the norms.

The biggest universities with known and appreciated historical faculties (Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, Wrocław, Lublin, Gdańsk, Łódź) usually do not follow the strict division between universal and Polish history. The topics taught are usually subordinated to the interests of the lecturer and teaching often leads to the publication of new books (as in the case of Jacek Banaszkiewicz' research on medieval *fabulae* or Tomasz Kitzwalter's work on the formation of the Polish nation). Although the financial situation of historical faculties is rather miserable, there are no signs of any serious generational conflict and the integration of younger historians into the scientific community does not meet obstacles of other than financial character.

After 1989, the number of research institutions and scientific organizations increased, though not all of them are actually active. Among the most efficient and interesting are the following:

Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk (Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences). The institute is led by Stanisław Bylina. It is the biggest research institute, based on the organizational plan of the Soviet academy, similar to history institutes in other countries of the Eastern block. Its centre is in Warsaw. The institute employs more than a hundred established scholars, some of them among the most prominent: Maria Bogucka, Jerzy Jedlicki, Marcin Kula, Stanisław Bylina, Halina Manikowska, and many others. The initial centralized structure has developed into a federation of 'workshops' devoted to different historical problems (e.g., 'The History of the Intelligentsia,' 'The History of Social Change in 20th-Century Poland'). Its employees do not have teaching obligations; the whole institution is devoted to research goals. It runs several long-term projects with memorable traditions: the Polish Biographic Dictionary, the Polish Historical Atlas, and others.

The IH PAN is financed from public funds. Depending on the personnel situation, the Institute may organize Ph.D. studies (until recently, there had been a dozen Ph.D. students; nowadays the number is increasing, as the Institute is raising the number of not-paid Ph.D. students). The members of the Institute edit several prominent periodicals, e.g., *Przegląd Historyczny*, *Dzieje Najnowsze*. The Institute co-operates with the publisher DiG.

Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej (Institute of East-Central Europe) in Lublin. The Institute is led by Jerzy Kłoczowski; it mostly deals with Polish–Ukrainian relations, though theoretically its interests cover the whole of East-Central Europe. The Institute is known for its numerous publications (among them the latest Polish edition of Yaroslav Hrytsak's *History of Ukraine*, Zachar Szybieka's work on the history of Belarus and the Polish translation of Jenő Szűcs's essay on historical regions⁵⁷ and collective volumes on certain East-Central European problems).⁵⁸ It runs huge international projects such as the *Dzieje Białorusi, Litwy, Polski i Ukrainy* [History of Belarus, Lithuania and Ukraine]. The work of the Institute has been honoured by CISH, which appointed Kłoczowski to the position of director of the committee of regional studies (from 1997).

Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN (Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences) in Warsaw. Under the directorship of Andrzej Paczkowski, the Institute deals with the history of the Communist period as well as social and cultural history as a whole. It publishes the periodical *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*. Its director and some of its employees (Andrzej Friszke, Marcin Zaremba) make the ISP PAN one of the most important institution conducting research on the Communist period. Two members of the institute published two of the best syntheses of post-1945 history (Paczkowski and Friszke).

Ośrodek Karta in Warsaw is a private enterprise publishing the periodical *Karta* (on contemporary history) and several books on the recent past. The institution also maintains archives on Poles deported from the east and on the democratic opposition. It is a rare example of a high-level historical publishing house which works without considerable state support (it is partly financed by the Batory and Ford foundations, and the periodical *Karta* is a profitable enterprise). *Ośrodek Karta* plays an important role as a supporter of young scholars, who co-operate with and/or work for the institute.

The *Instytut Zachodni* in Poznań specializes in the research of the history of Great Poland and in Polish–German relations. Originally, after WWII, it was designed to be a centre for political research on the Germans and former German territories. Currently it publishes the periodical *Przegląd Zachodni* as well as many separate historical works, also in German and in co-operation with German publishers.

The *Instytut Pamięci Narodowej* (IPN) publishes the periodical *Biuletyn Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej*, which contains information and analyses related to the research topics of the Institute. It plays the important role of employing many young historians who would have problems finding their place within the university structures. Also an important merit from their point of view is the wide network of branch offices all over the country, which provides young historians living outside the biggest academic centres with workplaces.

The *Żydowski Instytut Historyczny* deals with the history of Polish Jews. It also has a large archival collection on the recent history of Polish Jews, containing interviews with survivors of the Holocaust as well. The ŻIH publishes the periodical *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*.

The *Niemiecki Instytut Historyczny* (Deutsche Historische Institut), despite its limited aims, plays a very important role by publishing and supporting the publication of works concerning Polish–German relations, both in Poland and in Germany (an example is the series *Klio w Niemczech/Klio in Polen*). It hosts German post-graduates, and young scholars dealing with Polish history and offers a rich and well organized selection of German and Polish historical publications. It is also the hosting institution of international research projects and conferences. In 2006 it was finally supplemented by the Centre for Historical Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences placed in Berlin. The Academy plans to open other historical institutes based on the former foreign stations of the PAN, beginning with the one in Vienna.

It is evident that after the fall of the Communist regime the number of scientific journals increased. This situation is especially characteristic of the humanities. At the same time, it should be pointed out that Polish popular historical periodicals are not so popular and numerous as their counterparts in the Czech Republic or Hungary. The leading periodicals are published in Warsaw—*Kwartalnik Historyczny* by the Polish Academy of Sciences and *Przegląd Historyczny* by the Faculty of History of Warsaw University. The circles of authors often overlap and it would be hard to connect any of these journals to one specific methodological or generational orientation.

Since 1989, the number of historical publications has been constantly increasing. With regard to translations, two features of the current production should be mentioned: the prevalence of translations

from English and the terrible *niveau* of Polish texts. Specifically, translations very often offer only the text itself, while the critical apparatus (footnotes, bibliography) is either completely ignored by the publisher, or is not translated into Polish. In a translated book one would sometimes find a reference to the English translation of a Polish work instead of the Polish original. The reasons for this situation are simple: the increasing number of books and the declining interest of readers forces publishers to cut the expenses.

Among original Polish publications we find historical series, sometimes with year-long traditions. One of the most popular series is called *Ceram* (C.W. Ceram's *Götter, Gräber und Gelehrte* was one of the first books published in the series; it includes books of Polish and foreign authors). Two series of popular biographies are by the Ossolineum and the Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy. There are series of national histories (e.g., by the Ossolineum). New series, starting in the 1990s are the following: *Poznańska Biblioteka Niemiecka* (a series of translations from German: Norbert Elias, Walter Benjamin, Wolf Lepenies, Jürgen Kocka, Gottfried Benn, Christoph Klessmann); *Monografie Fundacji na rzecz Nauki Polskiej* (history and literary history; among the most interesting historical publications within this series are Magdalena Micińska, *Między Królem Duchem a mieszczaninem*; Jerzy Michalski, *Sarmacki republikanizm w oczach Francuza*; Wojciech Wrzosek, *Historia – Kultura – Metafora*; Jacek Banaszkiewicz, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka*; Tomasz Stryjek, *Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego*). Two series by Trio are *Historia Państw Świata w XX wieku* (contemporary histories of states) and a series of monographs on the Communist period.

Since the fall of Stalinism, Polish historical science has gradually grown more and more independent from the propagandist campaigns of the authorities of the time. Thus, historical handbooks used in university teaching rarely had to be changed after 1989. Most of the frequently used handbooks (except those on 20th-century history) are still in use (by Stefan Kieniewicz and Janusz Pajewski on the 19th century, by Tadeusz Manteuffel on the Middle Ages, by Emanuel Rostworowski for the 18th century), though some of them are methodologically outdated already (it is especially obvious in the case of the history of 19th-century Poland by Kieniewicz).

Among new university-level handbooks one should mention the following: Andrzej Chwalba, *Historia Polski 1795–1918*, Maria Bogucka, *Historia Polski do 1864 r.* Hanna Dylągowa, *Historia Polski 1795–1990*, and Jerzy Kłoczowski, *Historia Polski. Od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XV w.* These, methodologically rather classical, works and new versions of older publications are used at history faculties. For its thematic novelty, one must make special mention of Andrzej Paczkowski's *Pół wieku dziejów Polski*. It is a fresh attempt at interpreting the history of Poland from 1939. The book is based on extensive archival research and it is probably the first to objectively present not only Polish–German relations during the war, but the Polish–Soviet conflict and the internal conflicts of Communist Poland as well. In 2003, another synthesis of post-1945 history was published, by Andrzej Friszke. The first reactions (reviews by Andrzej Garlicki and Jerzy Jedlicki) value this new attempt to interpret contemporary history highly.

It is customary that for history teaching Polish universities use as many textbooks as possible, in addition to the obligatory handbooks. Thus, at this level of education, dozens of thematically oriented textbooks are used. After 1989, the overwhelming majority of published sources were concerned with the contemporary history of Poland. Their publication was closely related to the new archival regulations and the anniversaries of crucial moments of post-war Poland. The first wave of textbooks addressed the topic of Katyń and the Polish prisoners of Gulag. Simultaneously with the publication of contemporary sources, already established networks of scholars continued long-term projects, e.g., on Polish–Russian sources and the history of Congress Kingdom (supervised by Wiktoria Śliwowska from the Polish side) among many others. As one of the most interesting new enterprises, one should mention the series *Dokumenty do dziejów PRL* (Documents concerning the history of PRL). It also includes volumes that appeared as a result of Polish–Russian co-operation (*Polska w dokumentach z archiwów rosyjskich 1949–1953*, (Poland in Russian documents) ed. by A. Kochański, G. Murashko, A. Noskov, A. Paczkowski, K. Persak. Another interesting series of sources is *Źródła do historii Polski XX wieku – ze zbiorów Centralnego Archiwum Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnętrznych i Administracji* (Sources from the Ministry of Interior Affairs). There is also an immense number of textbooks on the 1968 anti-Semitic and anti-intellectual campaign.

Finally it is worth mentioning that the almost completely free market of high-school handbooks and educational programs created many possibilities to publish various attempts at a critical re-interpretation of Polish history as well as world history. Some of the new textbooks are written by prominent scholars, members of the Academy of Sciences, usually in co-operation with experienced high-school teachers. These works replace not only old-style handbooks, but also books that are extremely popular among high-school and university students, like Norman Davies' *God's Playground*. The disadvantages of the new situation are of two opposite types: on the one hand, the majority of new textbooks are overloaded by unnecessary information, which makes it hard to assimilate their content; on the other hand, these works are the last widely read history books, as the wave of public interest in the past characterizing the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s has already vanished.

Another important group of historical textbooks are those for gymnasias and high-schools. At the Millennium, the Polish Ministry of National Education and Sport introduced a reform. Instead of the two-step educational system (8 years of elementary school plus 4 years of secondary school), a three-step system was created (6 years of elementary school, 3 years of gymnasium, plus 3 years of lyceum). As one could have expected, the new order generated a political debate; the debate concentrated on problems of the centralization of education, training schools, the new model of maturity exams, university admissions and the locations of new gymnasias. Surprisingly (at first glance), less attention was paid to the new curricula, especially in the humanities. But this lack of interest could be easily explained: as one of the principles of the reform was the democratization of education, teachers were allowed to choose textbooks according to their needs and taste. The Ministry prepared only very general outlines (so-called program basis) and within three years almost a hundred new titles of history textbooks appeared on the market. Neither the government, nor professional publisher associations were able to control them effectively.

The first systematic survey of the new history textbooks was made in 2002 by two NGOs, both sponsored by the Soros Foundation (Fundacja Stefana Batorego).⁵⁹ Leaving aside the question of the professional level of gymnasium textbooks, the variety of narratives is a rather positive phenomenon.

9. THE PRESENCE OF HISTORICAL STUDIES IN OTHER MEDIA

Theoretically, public broadcasting has obligatory cultural duties to perform, including the historical education of society. During the last decade, Polish public TV (TVP1, TVP2 and the regional net TVP3) has not done enough to achieve that aim. Nevertheless, several historical series were broadcast after 1989. The probably most popular historical program is "Sensacje XX Wieku," directed and produced by Bogusław Wołoszański (meanwhile declared a collaborator of the secret police in the Communist period as a press correspondent in the West). It is primarily devoted to the history of WWII, with an emphasis on the military and sensation-seeking. Its educational value is thus low, but its popularity is growing. Recently, Wołoszański's program has been adapted to TV-theatre: all the events are portrayed by popular Polish actors.

Norbert Baliszewski, a historian active in the Polish underground, produced the program "Rewizja Nadzwyczajna," mostly devoted to the anti-Communist opposition in the first years after the war. It is, beyond doubt, professional and interesting, though sometimes accused of rightist sympathies. Much more controversial was Baliszewski's attempt to secure public attention by publishing a scandalous article in *Newsweek* about the death of Władysław Sikorski in a plane accident. The article was heavily criticized by professional historians, above all by Andrzej Garlicki in *Polityka*. Recently another historical program on the history of the PRL appeared. However, all of these programs are broadcast very much outside of prime time. More attention is paid to historical matters in the regional TV-net (TVP3, federation of public regional broadcasting), which – unfortunately – almost exclusively features American or English films. Private, accessible TV channels (TVN, Polsat, TV4) do not contribute to historical education.

The public radio (Program 1, Program 2, Program 3) sometimes presents historical commentaries. Program 2 started transmitting meetings of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, but this experiment was not continued. Most interesting public historical debates take place in newspapers. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, *Rzeczpospolita*, *Życie* as well as the weekly *Polityka* follow these debates and some of the current debates (e.g., on the *Vertreibungszentrum* or Jedwabne) are present exclusively in newspapers, apart from the historical periodicals.

10. FUNDING AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The difference between the funding of historical research and of publication is evident. Universities usually do not finance research, nor has the Academy of Sciences funds to support new initiatives. Project funding is usually provided by the *Komitet Badań Naukowych* (Scientific Research Committee), the centralized agency for distributing state research funds, though other branches of science have priority over the humanities. Frequently (though of course unofficially), the sources meant to support projects are spent on the everyday functioning of institutes. When this happens, it is mostly domestic and foreign foundations that can be relied on for the support of historical research: the Batory Foundation, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, the Volkswagen Stiftung, the *Fundacja na rzecz nauki Polskiej*, the Stiftung für deutsch-polnische Zusammenarbeit and others. The advantage of this type of funding is the broadening of international co-operation; a disadvantage is that, unfortunately, it is not easy to obtain research funds for provincial initiatives.

Historical publications may count on much more financial support, both state-controlled and private. To the list of foundations supporting historical research one could add ministerial funds, sometimes funds of the National Assembly, university funds and publication grants of the KBN.

The recent financial crisis has affected the situation of research institutions. State-financed institutes are forced to cut expenses, as their budgets are decreasing. The situation is also disastrous for private enterprises (for instance, the Karta) which were usually (though inadequately) supported from state-controlled funds. Lack of financial support is one of the reasons of the rising number of evening students at historical faculties of Polish universities, which – indirectly – results in lower educational standards and takes away time from research, forcing university historians to concentrate on teaching.

Joining the European Union did not have an unambiguously positive impact on the financing of scientific institutions. American foundations gradually withdraw, and it may take time until Polish applicants find their way to European grants. In the long run, this change in the type of financing may generate such changes as the decomposition of the Historical Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the creation of Western-type smaller institutes.

As for the migration of researchers, we can hardly speak about external brain drain in the case of Polish historians. The situation of researchers in the natural sciences is fundamentally different; in their case, a wave of emigration to the West is visible. Polish historians, in contrast, are less in demand in other countries. Nevertheless, some of them made remarkable careers in the West. After 1989, many former Polish emigrants started closely co-operating with Polish institutions, some even returned to the country (such as R. Szporluk, P. Wandycz, B. Baczko).

There is also hardly any internal brain drain of Polish historians. As opposed to the Communist period, we may observe a certain decentralization of historical research and historical education, which means that regional historians find their place in regional educational centers. In certain cases (especially in western areas of the country), these regional universities and research institutions have better connections with foreign (primarily German) scientific communities and networks than with Warsaw.

Another sad consequence of the financial crisis is the poverty of history Ph.D. students. They are mostly left without any stipend. In this group, a tendency to emigrate can be observed but it is far too early to say whether this wave of emigration tends to be permanent or rather short-term phenomenon. Unfortunately, young people who move abroad often do not pursue scientific careers. To avoid the loss of the talented youth, the weekly *Polityka* recently organized the action "Stay with us," paying stipends to Ph.D. students and young researchers in need. On a more institutionalized level, the Foundation for Polish Science supports numerous doctoral students and young scholars, among them many historians.

11. CONCLUSIONS

The political role of historiography fortunately does not mean that the historical community is used by politicians in internal or external conflicts. Political interest in the past concentrates on particular issues (Jedwabne, the IPN) and does not bring with it any personal interventions. On the financial level, the funding of research in Polish history is too decentralized to become an easy object of political manipulation. The obvious way to introduce one's political vision seems to

lead through creating new state institutions (such as the IPN), which still leaves an open space for historians of other convictions to act apart from the political sphere. At the same time, in the first years after the collapse of the Communist regime, many historians actively took part in political debates. Since 2001, after the spectacular defeat of *Unia Wolności*, they were forced to leave the foreground, to be replaced by more pragmatic (and populist) players. Beyond any doubt, Polish historians still play a supporting role in Polish–German, Polish–Ukrainian and Polish–Jewish relations. This feature of Polish historical research will probably survive the forthcoming years. One should expect the rising of interest in the old debate on Poland's place within (or outside) Europe connected with the political and economic process of joining the EU—but it would be difficult to find traces of such interest in recent publications.

In closing, one should mention two promising research initiatives. One is connected to the immense development of archaeological research, due to the national program of highway building. The range of this research is not matched in the history of Polish archaeology. It is also the biggest archaeological exploration in contemporary Europe, yielding lots of material for pre-medieval and early-medieval studies. We should expect an equivalent volume of valuable publications based on the new sources (which may prove to be the greatest advantage of the highway enterprise in employment terms, as the number of archaeologists is greater than the number of workers).

The second initiative worth mentioning is the project of Jerzy Jedlicki's group, consisting of members of the Department of History of the PAN: the history of the Polish intelligentsia from its origins to the 20th century. Together with the already existing studies on Polish intelligentsia published after 1989, it will allow me to add this topic to the list of the most important and most popular themes of historical research in Poland from 1989 on.

To sum up: it is probable that the majority of the historical debates and research topics of the last decade will survive another decade or more. One can expect that in several years, public interest in contemporary history will decline, and other periods, especially the Polish republican gentry culture of the 17th century, will regain its attractiveness. Nothing indicates that the history of Polish–Jewish or Polish–German relations might lose its popularity but it will be interesting to see if the

complex Polish-Russian ‘entangled history’ will become an object of fruitful international cooperation. It is hard to foresee whether joining the EU will bring broader comparative research, questioning the old myths of Polish uniqueness, or, on the contrary, a new wave of “national historiography.” Whatever the course of the development of research interests will be, the most important thing is to maintain the intellectual freedom achieved in the wake of 1989.

NOTES

- 1 Tazbir, “Time in Old Polish Culture,” *Dialogue and Humanism* v. 4 1993/1
- 2 See Mikołajczyk, *Jak się pisało o historii...*
- 3 Fijałkowska, *Polityka i twórcy*; Hübner, *Nauka polska po II wojnie światowej – idee i instytucje*; idem: “Przebudowa nauk historycznych w Polsce (1947–1953),” *Przegląd Historyczny* 1987/3; Bębenek, *Myślenie o przeszłości*; idem, “Spory historyczne w polskiej prasie kulturalno-literackiej z lat 1945–1948,” *Dzieje Najnowsze* 1974/2; idem: “Problematyka historyczna w polskiej prasie społeczno-kulturalnej 1945–1966,” *Dzieje Najnowsze* 1978/3.
- 4 See Hübner, “Przebudowa nauk historycznych w Polsce (1947–1953),” *Przegląd Historyczny* 1987/3; Małowist, “Kilka uwag do artykułu Piotra Hübnera,” *ibidem*.
- 5 See Erdmann, *Die Ökumene der Historiker*, 290 and 317–319.
- 6 Jasnowski, “Analiza programów szkolnictwa wyższego i wytycznych prac naukowych w zakresie historii,” *Kultura* 1952/2 (Sowietyzacja kultury w Polsce).
- 7 Valkenier, “Sovietization and Liberalization in Polish Postwar Historiography,” *Journal of Central European Affairs* 1959/2; Zernack, “Schwerpunkte und Entwicklungslinien der polnischen Geschichtswissenschaften nach 1945,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 1973 Sonderheft 5; idem: *Zwischen Kritik und Ideologie. Methodologische Probleme der polnischen Historikerkongreß in Breslau 1948*; Breyer, “Die Polnische Milleniums-Diskussion zwischen Geschichtswissenschaft und Ideologie,” in Breyer (ed.), *Probleme der Wissenschaft in heutigen Polen*. In the 1950s Herbert Ludat was a severe critic of Polish Marxist historiography: “Die deutsch – polnische Vergangenheit in marxistischen Sicht,” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 1952/1; idem: “Das sowjetische Geschichtsbild Polens,” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 1952/3.
- 8 Zernack, “Die Entwicklung der polnischen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945,” in *Die Interdependenz von Geschichte und Politik in Osteuropa seit 1945. Historiker – Fachtagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde e. V., Berlin vom 9. – 11. 6. 1976 in Bad Wiessee. Protokoll*, ed. Günther Stökl, 112–113. Zernack’s remark refers to the foundation of the IH PAN, based

on the Soviet organizational model (with a clear division between researchers and teachers). This was meant to compensate for the low influence of Marxism on Polish historian-teachers. (The Institute was at the same time the place where the Marxist cadres were educated and the refuge for some of those professors who were not allowed to teach.)

- 9 Bogucka, "Życie codzienne—spory wokół profilu badań i definicji," *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 1996/3.
- 10 See Czuby, *Wodzowie i politycy. Generalicja polska lat 1806–1815*.
- 11 See Jarosz, *Polityka władz komunistycznych w Polsce w latach 1948–1956 a chłopcy*; idem, *Polacy a stalinizm*; Kosiński, *O nową mentalność. Życie codzienne w szkołach 1945–1956*; Sowiński, *Komunistyczne święto. Obchody 1 maja w latach 1948–1954*; Kochanowicz, *ZMP w terenie. Stalinowska próba modernizacji opornej rzeczywistości*; Brodała, Lisiecka, and Ruzikowski, *Przebudować człowieka. Komunistyczne wysiłki zmiany mentalności*; Kosiński, *Nastolatki '81. Świadomość młodzieży w epoce "Solidarności"*; Brzostek, *Robotnicy Warszawy. Konflikty codzienne (1950–1954)*.
- 12 See Kurczewska, "New Modes of Theorising about Nations and Nationalism (Attempt at an Evaluation)," in Sujecka (ed.), *The National Idea as a Research Problem*; Kizwalter, "National Historiography and its Ideological Conditions (19th – 20th Century)," in *The National Idea as a Research Problem*, ed. Jolanta Sujecka; idem: *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek polski*.
- 13 Stryjek, *Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego. Analiza wybranych koncepcji*.
- 14 Baczko, *Wyobrażenia społeczne. Szkice o nadziei i pamięci zbiorowej*.
- 15 Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652*.
- 16 Wapiński, *Historia polskiej myśli politycznej XIX i XX wieku*, Gdańsk.
- 17 Kłoczowski, *Młodsza Europa: Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia w kręgu cywilizacji chrześcijańskiej średniowiecza*.
- 18 Banaszkiewicz, *Podanie o Piaście i Popielu. Studium porównawcze nad wczesnośredniowiecznymi tradycjami dynastycznymi*, idem, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne Mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka*.
- 19 Deptuła, *Galla Anonima mit genezy Polski. Studium z historiozofii i hermeneutyki symboli dziejopisarstwa średniowiecznego*.
- 20 Żmudzki, "Spór o analizę strukturalną podań i mitów dotyczących 'Początku' Polski (na marginesie książek Jacka Banaszkiewicza i Czesława Deptuły)".
- 21 Banaszkiewicz, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne Mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka*.
- 22 Mączak, *Nierówna przyjaźń: układy klientalne w perspektywie historycznej*.
- 23 Dziegielewski, *Izba poselska w systemie władzy Rzeczypospolitej w czasach Władysława IV.*; Hołdys, *Praktyka parlamentarna za panowania Władysława IV Wazy*; Matwijów, *Ostatnie sejmy przed abdykacją Jana Kazimierza. 1667 i 1668*; Naworski, *Sejmik generalny Prus Królewskich 1569–1772. Organizacja i funkcjonowanie na tle zgromadzeń stanowych prowincji*; Rachuba, *Konfederacja kmieciowska i Związek Braterski wojska literuskiego w latach 1660–1663*;

- Stanek, *Konfederacje generalne w Koronie w XVIII wieku*; Wyczański, *Między kulturą a polityką. Sekretarze królewscy Zygmunta Starego (1506–1548)*; *Akta sejmiku podolskiego in hostico 1672–1698*, ed. Stoliczka, *Staropolska sztuka wojenna XVI–XVII wieku. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Jęremie Maciszewskiemu*, ed. Mirosław Nagielski.
- 24 Dygo, Gawlas and Grala, *Stosunki międzywyznaniowe w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej w XIV–XVII wieku*, Dygo, Gawlas and Grala, *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje. Materiały z konferencji “Trzysta lat od początku unii polsko-saskiej.”*
 - 25 The Institute published numerous volumes on the Belarusian and Ukrainian questions from the Middle Ages to 1989, including publications by Ukrainian and Belarusian historians (such as those mentioned above, by Yaroslav Hrytsak and Natalia Yakovenko). See also a synthesis of Belarusian history: Sahanowicz, *Historia Białorusi do końca XVIII wieku*, Szybieka, *Historia Białorusi 1795–2000*.
 - 26 Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek polski*.
 - 27 Kądziela, *Między zdradą a służbą Rzeczypospolitej. Fryderyk Mo-szyński w latach 1792–1793*; idem, „O potrzebie badań nad dziejami Targowicy”; idem, „Opcja grodzieńska.”
 - 28 Janowski, *Polska myśl liberalna do 1918 roku*; Bernacki, *Jednostka, naród, niepodległość. Myśl polityczna demoliberalistów galicyjskich (1882–1905)*.
 - 29 Karpiński, *Polska a Rosja. Z dziejów słowiańskiego sporu*; Opacki, *Barbaria rosyjska. Rosja w historii i myśli politycznej Henryka Kamińskiego* (Gdańsk: 1993); Nowak, *Między carem a rewolucją. Studium politycznej wyobraźni i postaw Wielkiej Emigracji wobec Rosji 1831–1849*; Wierzbicki, *Groźni i wielcy. Polska myśl historyczna XIX i XX wieku wobec rosyjskiej despotii*.
 - 30 de Custine, *Rosja w roku 1839*, 2 vols.; Kamiński, *Rosja i Europa. Polska. Wstęp do badań nad Rosją i Moskalami*.
 - 31 See Śliwowska, *Syberia w życiu i w pamięci Gieysztorów*.
 - 32 See Tomaszewski (ed.), *Najnowsze dzieje Żydów w Polsce w zarysie (do 1950 roku)*; Tazbir, *Protokoły mędrców Syjonu*; Prokop-Janiec, *Międzywojenna literatura polsko-żydowska jako zjawisko kulturowe i artystyczne*; Czajkowski, *Lud przymierza*; Kersten, *Polacy – Żydzi – Komunizm. Anatomia półprawd 1929–1968*; Chodakiewicz, *Żydzi i Polacy 1918–1955. Współistnienie – zagłada – komunizm*; Fuks, *Żydzi w Polsce. Dawniej i dziś*; Aleksy, *Dokąd dalej? Ruch syjonistyczny w Polsce (1944–1950)*; Redlich, *Razem i osobno. Polacy, Żydzi, Ukraińcy w Brzeżanach 1919–1945*; and translations: Tollet, *Historia Żydów w Polsce od XVI wieku do rozbiorów*, trans. D. Zamojska; Haumann, *Historia Żydów w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej*.
 - 33 See the periodical *Przegląd Polonijny* as well as recent publications Walaszek (ed.), *Diaspora polska*; Adam Koseski (ed.), *Emigracja z ziem polskich w XX wieku. Drogi awansu emigrantów*; Erdmans, *Opposite Poles: Immigrants and Ethnic in Polish Chicago, 1976–1990*; Giza, *Chłopi polscy na wyspach duńskich (1893–1939)*; Kaczmarek, *Dzieje Polaków na ziemiach*

- bułgarskich; Kaczmarek, *Na węgierskiej ziemi. Rzecz o Polonii węgierskiej*; Bukowczyk (ed.), *Polish Americans and Their History. Community, Culture and Politics*.
- 34 Górnicka-Boratyńska (ed.), *Chcemy całego życia. Antologia polskich tekstów feministycznych z lat 1870–1939*.
- 35 Walczewska, *Damy, rycerze, feministki. Kobiety dyskurs emancypacyjny w Polsce*; Borkowska, *Cudzoziemki. Studia o polskiej prozie kobiecej*; Kłosińska, *Ciało, pożądanie, ubranie. O wczesnych powieściach Gabrieli Zapolskiej*; Umińska, *Postać z cieniem. Portrety Żydówek w polskiej literaturze od końca XIX wieku do 1939 roku*; Górnicka-Boratyńska, *Staniemy się sobą. Cztery projekty emancypacji (1863–1939)*.
- 36 Janion, *Kobiety i duch inności*.
- 37 Żarnowska and Szwarc (eds.), *Kobieta i świat polityki*; Żarnowska and Szwarc (eds.), *Kobieta i kultura czasu wolnego*; Żarnowska and Szwarc (eds.), *Kobieta i praca. Wiek XIX i XX*.
- 38 See Borodziej and Hajnicz (eds.), *Kompleks wypędzenia*.
- 39 See Kobylińska (ed.), *Erinnern, Vergessen, Verdrängen. Polnische und deutsche Erfahrungen*, Kobylińska, Kosiewski and Motyka (eds.), *Historycy polscy i ukraińscy wobec problemów XX wieku*; Motyka, *Akcja “Wiśła,”*; Madajczyk, *Przylączenie Śląska Opolskiego do Polski 1945–1948*; Jonca, *Wysiedlenia Niemców i osadnictwo ludności polskiej na obszarze Krzyżowa–Świdnica w latach 1945–1948*; Borodziej and Lemberg (eds.), *Nasza ojczyzna stała się dla nas obcym państwem... Niemcy w Polsce 1945–1950. Wybór dokumentów*, v. 1 (1st vol. on the Olsztyn area; the edition also appears in German in Marburg); Misilo, *Akcja “Wiśła,” Tematy polsko-litewskie. Historia, literatura, edukacja*.
- 40 The most interesting works are Kaźmierska, *Doświadczenia wojenne Polaków a kształtowanie się tożsamości etnicznej. Analiza narracji kresowych*; Sakson, *Stosunki narodowościowe na Warmii i Mazurach 1945–1997*; Ciesielski (ed.), *Przesiedlenie ludności polskiej z kresów wschodnich do Polski 1944–1947*.
- 41 Drozdowski, *Warsawa w obronie Rzeczypospolitej, czerwiec-sierpień 1920 r.*, 1993; *Wojna polsko-sowiecka 1920 roku*; Koryn (ed.), *Przebieg walk i tło międzynarodowe. Materiały sesji naukowej w Instytucie Historii PAN 1–2 października 1990*; Grzybowski, *Wojna polsko-rosyjska 1920 r. w Płocku i na Mazowszu*; Izdebski, *Działania wojenne na Podlasiu w sierpniu 1920 r.*; Łukomski, Polak and Wrzosek, *Wojna polsko-bolszewicka 1919–1920. Działania bojowe. Kalendarium*; Pruszyński, *Dramat Piłsudskiego. Wojna 1920*; Borkowski (ed.), *Rok 1920. Wojna polsko-radziecka we wspomnieniach i innych dokumentach*; Suchcitz, *Generałowie wojny polsko-sowieckiej 1919–1920*; Tarczyński, *Cud nad Wisłą. Bitwa warszawska 1920*; Szczepański, *Wojna 1920 na Mazowszu i Podlasiu*.
- 42 See overviews of the literature in Chodkiewicz, “Badania nad dziejami Polaków na Ukrainie Radzieckiej – zarys bibliograficzny”; Koseski, “Polacy w ZSRR – niektóre kierunki badań w historiografii polskiej.”

- 43 See, *PRL w oczach STASI*, eds. Borodziej and Kochanowski.
- 44 Jarosz and Pasztor, *W krzywym zwierciadle. Polityka władz komunistycznych w Polsce w świetle plotek i pogłosek z lat 1949–1956*; Brzostek, “Dźwięki i ikonosfera stalinowskiej Warszawy Anno Domini 1953,” *Polska 1944/45–1989. Studia i materiały* 2001.
- 45 See Jarosz, *Polityka władz komunistycznych w Polsce w latach 1948–1956 a chłopci*, idem, *Polacy a stalinizm*; Kosiński, *O nową mentalność. Życie codzienne w szkołach 1945–1956*; Sowiński, *Komunistyczne święto. Obchody 1 maja w latach 1948–1954*; Kochanowicz, *ZMP w terenie. Stalinowskie próba modernizacji opornej rzeczywistości*; Tymiński, *PZPR i przedsiębiorstwo. Nadzór partyjny nad zakładami przemysłowymi 1956–1970*; Zaremba, *Komunizm, legitymizacja, nacjonalizm. Nacjonalistyczna legitymizacja władzy komunistycznej w Polsce*; Stobiecki, *Historia pod nadzorem. Spory o nowy model historii w Polsce (II połowa lat czterdziestych – początek lat pięćdziesiątych)*; Górny, *Miedzy Marksem a Palackým. Historiografia w komunistycznej Czechosłowacji*; Lesiakowski, *Mieczysław Moczar, “Mietek.” Biografia polityczna*; Krawczyk, *Praska Wiosna 1968*; Kowalski, *Kryptonim “Dunaj.” Udział wojsk polskich w interwencji zbrojnej w Czechosłowacji w 1968 roku*; Górny, “Poles in Czech Eyes in the Wake of August 1968”.
- 46 Apart from articles in the daily and weekly press, a collection of translated texts by the participants of the Walser-Bubis debate was published by the Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych (Centre for International Relations) in Warsaw: Wóycicki and Buras (eds.), *Spór o niemiecką pamięć. Debata Walser-Bubis*.
- 47 *Polityka* is a socio-political weekly, aiming in resembling *The Economist*. It was established in the 1960s as an official magazine for the intellectually more sophisticated reader. Its chief redactor was Mieczysław F. Rakowski, former prime minister and the last general secretary of PZPR. After 1989 *Polityka* became a politically moderate magazine for the middle class and the intelligentsia.
- 48 *Tygodnik Powszechny* was created after 1945 in Cracow as a weekly journal for moderate Catholic intellectuals. During the whole Communist period, its chief redactor was Jerzy Turowicz. In the years 1953–1956 *Tygodnik* was banned for not having printed the necrology of Stalin. In 1956 it was returned to the original redactors. *Tygodnik* is perceived as a journal for Catholic intellectuals.
- 49 *Nowa Res Publica* is a continuation of the samizdat cultural magazine *Res Publica*. It publishes articles on history, literature and culture, especially devoted to East-Central Europe.
- 50 See Paczkowski, “Czy historycy dokonali obrachunku z PRL?,” in *Ofiary czy współwinni. Nazizm i sowietyzm w świadomości historycznej*.
- 51 *Tygodnik Solidarność* was a samizdat daily of the Mazovian region of *Solidarność* created in 1980–81. Its official continuation after 1989 is a rightist

- daily also publishing historical analyses, with special interest in the Communist period.
- 52 See Prokop, *Pisarze w służbie przemocy*; idem, *Sowietyzacja i jej maski*; Urbankowski, *Czerwona msza, albo uśmiech Stalina*.
 - 53 Gross, *Sąsiedzi. Historia zagłady żydowskiego miasteczka. Pamięci Szmula Wasersztajna*.
 - 54 For the documentation of the Jedwabne-debate see the special issue of *The Polish Review*, vol. XLVI/2001/4 including the text "Neighbours Reconsidered" by Piotr Wróbel.
 - 55 Rybicka, *Instytut Niemieckiej Pracy Wschodniej. Cracow 1940–1945*.
 - 56 Reviews and further information are available at www.or.icm.edu.pl.
 - 57 Szűcs, *Trzy Europy*.
 - 58 Skarbek (ed.), *Białoruś, Czechosłowacja, Litwa, Polska, Ukraina. Mniejszości w świetle spisów statystycznych XIX i XX wieku. Liczebność i rozmieszczenie – stosunki narodowościowe – polityka narodowościowa*; Lewandowski (ed.), *Trudna tożsamość. Problemy narodowe i religijne w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej w XIX i XX wieku*.
 - 59 The text is available at www.or.icm.edu.pl.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam Naruszewicz i historiografia Oświecenia* [Adam Naruszewicz and Enlightened Historiography] ed. Kazimierz Bartkiewicz (Zielona Góra: Verbum, 1998)
- Natalia Aleksion, *Dokąd dalej? Ruch syjonistyczny w Polsce (1944–1950)* [Where To Now? Zionist Movement in Poland 1944–1950] (Warsaw: Trio, 2005)
- Bronisław Baczko, *Wyobrażenia Społeczne. Szkice O Nadziei I Pamięci Zbiorowej*. [Social Imagination. Sketches on Collective Hopes and Memory] (Warsaw: PWN, 1994)
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, "Entre la description historiographique et le schéma structurel. L'image de la communauté tribale: l'exemple des Lučane," in *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe: actes du colloque organisé par Fondation Européenne de la Science au Centre de Recherches Historiques et Juridiques de l'Université Paris i du 29 mars au 1er avril 1989*, ed. Jean-Philippe Genet (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991)
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, "Les hastes colorées des Wisigoths d'Euric," *Revue de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 1994, Fasc. 2.
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, "Les lieux du pouvoir dans le haut Moyen Age," in *Lieux Du Pouvoir Au Moyen Age et à l'époque Moderne*, ed. M. Tymowski (Warsaw: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1995)
- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne Mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka* [Polish Fairy History by Wincenty Kadłubek] (Wrocław: Leopoldinum, 1998)

- Jacek Banaszkiewicz, "Slawische Mythologie," in *Lexikon Des Mittelalters*, Vol. 6, (München: LexMa, 1994)
- Henryk Barycz, *Historyk gniewny i niepokorny. Rzecz o Wacławie Sobieskim* [The Indignated and Insubmissive Historian Wacław Sobieski] (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1978)
- Daniel Beauvois, "Être historien en Pologne: les mythes, l'amnésie et la vérité," *Revue d'histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 1991 Vol. 37.
- Stanisław T. Bębenek, *Myślenie o przeszłości* [Thinking the Past] (Warsaw: PIW, 1981)
- Stanisław T. Bębenek, "Spory historyczne w polskiej prasie kulturalnoliterackiej z lat 1945-1948," [History Debates in Polish Cultural Press 1945-1948] *Dzieje Najnowsze* 1974/2.
- Stanisław T. Bębenek, "Problematyka historyczna w polskiej prasie społeczno-kulturalnej 1945-1966," [History Debates in Polish Cultural Press 1945-1966] *Dzieje Najnowsze* 1978/3.
- Włodzimierz Bernacki, *Jednostka, Naród, Niepodległość. Myśl Polityczna Demoliberalistów Galicyjskich* [Unity, Nation and Independence. The Political Thought of Galician Liberal Democrats (1882-1905)] (Cracow: Aureus, 1997)
- Piotr Biliński, *Władysław Konopczyński, historyk i polityk II Rzeczypospolitej* [Władysław Konopczyński, Historian and Politician of the 2nd Republic] (Warsaw: Ad Astra, 1999)
- Barbara Bińko, "Skąd przychodzili, dokąd zmierzali...Aspiranci I roczn. IKKN," [Where Did They Come From, Where Did They Follow...The Candidates of the First Year at IKKN] in *Komunizm. Ideologia, System, Ludzie*, ed. Tomasz Szarota, [Communism. Ideology, System, People], (Warsaw: Neriton, IH PAN, 2001)
- Marian Biskup and Gerard Labuda, *Die Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens in Preussen Wirtschaft, Gessellschaft, Staat, Ideologie*, Trans. J. Heyde & U. Kodur, (Osnabrück: Fibre, 2000)
- Maria Bogucka, "Die Wirkungen der Reformation in Danzig," *Zeitschrift Für Ostforschung*, Jg 42, 1993/2.
- Maria Bogucka, "Życie codzienne – spory wokół profilu badań i definicji," [Everyday-Life – the Debates on the Research Agenda and Definitions] *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 1996/3.
- Maria Bogucka, "Recruitment of Seamen for Gdańsk Ships in the 16th - 18th Centuries," *Northern Seas Yearbook*, 1994.
- Maria Bogucka, "Reflections on the Perception of Time in Poland in the 16th and 17th Centuries," *Dialogue and Humanism*, 1993/4.
- Maria Bogucka, "The Typology of the Polish Towns During the 16th - 18th Centuries," *The Journal of European Economic History*, 1996/2.
- Maria Bogucka, *The Lost World of the "Sarmatians." Custom as the Regulator of Polish Social Life in Early Modern Times* (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1996)

- Teresa Bogucka, "Nieuchronna normalność," [Inevitable Normality] *Gazeta Wyborcza* 28-29 XI 1992.
- Jerzy W. Borejsza, "La resistance Polonaise en débat," *Vingtième Siècle* 2000, No 67.
- Jerzy W. Borejsza, "La Russie moderne et l'union Soviétique dans l'historiographie Polonaise après 1989," *Cahiers Du Monde Russe. Russie-Empire-Russe, Union Soviétique-États Independants* 1999/3.
- Jerzy W. Borejsza, *Schulen des Hasses. Faschistische Bewegungen und Systeme in Europa* (Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1998)
- Grażyna Borkowska, "PRL a sprawa polska," [The PRL and the Polish Case] *Nowa Res Publica* 1993/3.
- Włodzimierz Borodziej and Jerzy Kochanowski, eds., *PRL w Oczach STASI* [People's Republic of Poland with the Eyes of the Stasi] (Warsaw: Fakt, 1995-1996)
- Włodzimierz Borodziej and Hans Lemberg, eds., *Nasza Ojczyzna Stała Się Dla Nas Obcym Państwem... Niemcy W Polsce, 1945-1950. Wybór Dokumentów* [Our Fatherland became a foreign country. Germans in Poland, 1945-1950. Selected Documents] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2000-2001)
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Polnische Zeitgeschichtliche Arbeiten über die Jahre 1939 bis 1945," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 1988/2
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Dylematy historyków," [Dilemmas of Historians] *Mówią Wieki* 1995/12.
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, *Warschauer Aufstand 1944* (Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 2004)
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Historiografia polska o wypędzeniu Niemców" [Polish Historiography on the Expulsion of Germans] in *Polska 1944/45-1989. Studia i Materiały*, Vol. 2 [The Same Text In Czech translation in *Soudobé Dějiny* 1997/2].
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Ostforschung aus der Sicht der Polnischen Geschichtsschreibung," *Zeitschrift Für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, Bd. 46 1997.
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Polen und Deutschland Seit 1945," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Bd 53, 1997.
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Poles and Jews in the 20th Century. The Persistence of Stereotypes after the Holocaust," in *Poland beyond Communism. "Transition" In Critical Perspective*, eds. M. Buchowski, E. Conte, C. Nagengast, (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 2000)
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, "Soziale und politische Konturen des polnischen Widerstandes," in *September 1939. Krieg, Besatzung, Widerstand in Polen*, ed. C. Kleßmann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1989)
- Włodzimierz Borodziej, *Terror und Politik. Die Deutsche Polizei und die polnische Widerstandsbeziehung im Geberalgouvernement 1939-1944* (Mainz: Phillip von Zabern, 1999)

- Kazimierz Braun, *A History of Polish Theater 1939-1989. Spheres of Captivity and Freedom* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996)
- Richard Breyer, "Die Polnische Milleniums-Diskussion Zwischen Geschichtswissenschaft Und Ideologie," in Richard Breyer (ed.), *Probleme Der Wissenschaft in Heutigen Polen* (Marburg/Lahn: J. G. Herder-Institut, 1968)
- Marta Brodala, Anna Lisiecka, Tadeusz Ruzikowski, *Przebudować Człowieka. Komunistyczne Wysiłki Zmiany Mentalności* [To Change the Man. Communist Efforts to Change Mentalities] (Warsaw: Trio, 2001)
- Julia Bryn-Zejmis, "National Self-Denial and Marxist Ideology: the Origin of the Communist Movement in Poland and the Jewish Question 1918-1923," *Nationality Papers* 1994, V. 22, Supplement 1.
- Błażej Brzostek, *Robotnicy Warszawy. Konflikty Codzienne (1950-1954)* [Warsaw Workers. Everyday Conflicts, 1950-54] (Warsaw: Trio, 2002)
- Błażej Brzostek, 'Dźwięki i ikonosfera stalinowskiej Warszawy Anno Domini 1953' [Sounds and Iconosphere of Stalinist Warsaw AD 1953], *Polska 1944/45-1989. Studia I Materiały* 2001.
- Błażej Brzostek, "Contrasts and Grayness: Looking at the First Decade of Postwar Poland," *Zeitschrift Für Moderne Europäische Geschichte-Journal of Modern European History-Revue D'histoire Européenne Contemporaine* 2004/1.
- John J. Bukowczyk, *Polish Americans and Their History: Community, Culture and Politics* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996)
- Alfredas Bumblauskas, "Kolizje historiograficzne. W kwestii charakterystyki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego," [Historiographical Collisions Concerning the Characteristics of the Great Duchy of Lithuania] *Lithuania*, 1995/1.
- Stanisław Bylina, "La Bible, les laics et l'église en Pologne entre le Moyen Âge et la Réforme," in *Häresie und Vorzeitige Reformation im Spätmittelalter*, ed. František Šmahel (München: Collegium Carolinum, 1998)
- Stanisław Bylina, "Les disputes hussites sur le purgatoire," in *In Memoriam Josefa Macka*, ed. M. Polívka, F. Šmahel (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1996)
- Stanisław Bylina, "Les influences hussites en Pologne et sur les territoires ethniquement Russiens de Grand-Duché de Lituanie," *Ricerche Slavistiche* 1994.
- Cenzura w PRL – relacje historyków* [Censorship in PRL – Historians' Relations] ed. Zbigniew Romek (Warsaw: Neriton, 2000)
- Elżbieta Cesarz, *Chłopi w polskiej myśli historycznej doby porzoborowej 1795-1864. Syntezy, parasyntezy i podręczniki dziejów ojczystych* [The Peasantry in Polish Historical Thought of the Post-Partition Period 1795-1864. Syntheses, Para-Syntheses and Textbooks in National History] (Rzeszów: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna, 1999)
- Marek Cetwiński, *Ideologia i poznanie. Społeczne funkcje mediewistyki śląskiej po 1945 r.* [Ideology and Knowledge. the Social Functions of Silesian Medieval Studies after 1945] (Częstochowa: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna, 1993)

- Chcemy całego życia. Antologia polskich tekstów feministycznych z lat 1870-1939* [We Want the Whole Life. Anthology of Polish Feminist Texts 1870-1939] ed. Aneta Górnicka-Boratyńska, (Warsaw: Res Publica, 1999)
- Marek A. Cichocki, *Władza i pamięć. O politycznej funkcji historii* [Power and Memory. The Political Function of History] (Cracow: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2005)
- Jan M. Chodakiewicz, *Żydzi i Polacy 1918-1955. Współistnienie – Zagłada – komunizm* [Jews and Poles 1918-1955. Coexistence – Shoah – Communism] (Warsaw: Fronda, 2000)
- Andrzej Chodkiewicz, “Badania nad Dziejami Polaków na Ukrainie Radzieckiej – Zarys Bibliograficzny,” [Research on the History of Poles in Soviet Ukraine – Bibliographical Overview] *Biuletyn Informacyjny* (Przemyśl) 1995/1.
- Andrzej Chojnowski, “Nieustanna obecność przeszłości,” [The Permanent Presence of the Past] *Nowa Res Publica* 1993/3.
- Christianity in East-Central Europe. Late Middle Ages*, ed. Jerzy Kłoczowski, Paweł Kras, Wojciech Polak (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 1999)
- Stanisław Ciesielski, Wojciech Wrzesiński, “Uwagi o stanie badań nad dziejami powojennej Polski,” [Remarks on the State of the Art in the Research of the History of Post-War Poland] *Polska 1944/45-1989* Vol 1.
- John Connelly, Teresa Suleja, “Projekt reformy personalnej polonistyki uniwersyteckiej Stefana Żółkiewskiego z 1950 roku,” [Stefan Żółkiewski’s ‘Project of the Personal Reform of University Studies in Polish Literature’ from 1950] *Arcana* 1997/2.
- John Connelly, *Captive University: the Sovietization of East German, Czech and Polish Higher Education 1945-1956* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)
- John Connelly, “Communist Higher Education in Czechoslovakia, Poland and East Germany”, in *The Establishment of Communist Regimes in Eastern Europe 1944-1949*, ed. Norman Naimark (Oxford: Westview Press, 1997)
- “Czy PRL była państwem totalitarnym?” [Was the PRL a Totalitarian State?] *Mówią Wieki* 1992/2.
- Astolphe De Custine, *Rosja W Roku 1839* [Russia in 1839] 2 Vols., Trans. Paweł Hertz (Warsaw: PIW, 1995)
- Michał Czajkowski: *Lud Przymierza* [The Chosen People] (Warsaw: Więź, 1992)
- Jarosław Czuby, *Wodzowie i Politycy. Generacja Polska Lat 1806-1815* [Leaders and Politicians. The Polish Generation of 1806-1815] (Warsaw: Viator, 1993)
- Roman Darowski, *Studies in the Philosophy of the Jesuits in Poland in the 16th to 18th Centuries* (Cracow: Ignatianum, 1999)
- Bronisław Dembiński, Oskar Halecki, Marcei Handelsman, *L’historiographie polonaise du XIX-me et du XX-me siècle* (Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff, 1933)

- Czesław Deptuła, *Galla Anonima mit genezy Polski. Studium z historiozofii i hermeneutyki symboli dziejopisarstwa średniowiecznego* [Gall Anonimus' Myth of the Genesis of Poland. Study on the Philosophy of History and Hermeneutics of the Symbols in Medieval Historiography] (Lublin: 1990, 2nd edition 2000)
- Der Letzte Ritter und erste Bürger im Osten Europas. Kościuszko, das aufständische Reformpolen und die Verbundenheit zwischen Polen und der Schweiz*, ed. H. Haumann, Jerzy Skowronek (Basel-Frankfurt/M: Schwabe & Co, 1996)
- Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung in Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik*, eds. Jan M. Piskorski, Rudolf Jaworski, Jörg Hackmann (Poznań: PTPN, 2002)
- Deutsch-polnische Beziehungen 1939-1945-1949. Eine Einführung*, eds. Włodzimierz Borodziej, Klaus Ziemer (Osnabrück: Fibre, 2000)
- Ewa Domańska, "Historiografia czasu postmodernizmu po postmodernizmie. Retrospekcja" [Historiography of Postmodernist Times in Times After Postmodernism] in *Wobec kultury. problemy antropologa*, ed. Grażyna E. Karpińska (Łódź: PTL, 1996)
- Bogusław Drewniak, *Polen und Deutschland 1919-1939. Wege und Irrwege kultureller Zusammenarbeit* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1999)
- Dziedzictwo Witolda Kuli* [Witold Kula's Legacy] eds. Nina Assorodobraj, Marcin Kula (Warsaw: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1990)
- Jan Dziegielewski, *Izba poselska w systemie władzy Rzeczypospolitej w czasach Władysława IV* [The House of Commons in the Political System of the Republic at Times of Władysław 4th] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1992)
- Jerzy Eisler, Krystyna Kersten, "Dyskusja nad historią PRL," [Discussion on the History of the PRL] *Polska 1944/45-1989. Studia i Materiały* 1995.
- Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Die Ökumene der Historiker. Geschichte Der Internationalen Historikerkongresse und des Comité International Des Sciences Historiques* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1987)
- Mary P. Erdmans, *Opposite Poles: Immigrants and Ethnicity in Polish Chicago, 1976-1990* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998)
- Barbara Fijałkowska, *Polityka i twórcy (1948-1959)* [Communist Politics in the Humanities] (Warsaw: PWN, 1985)
- Marta Fik, *Kultura polska po Jałcie - kronika lat 1944-1981* [The Polish Culture after Yalta] (London: Aneks, 1989)
- Andrzej Friszke, "Dziedzictwo PRL i nasza współczesna niepewność," [The Legacy of the PRL and Our Contemporary Uncertainty] *Nowa Res Publica* 1993/3.
- Andrzej Friszke, "Jakim państwem była Polska po 1956 r.? Spór historyków," [What Kind of State Was Poland After 1956? The Dispute of the Historians] *Wież*, September 1996.
- Marian Fuks, *Żydzi W Polsce. Dawniej i Dzisiaj* [Jews in Poland. In the Past and Present] (Poznań: 2000)

- Andrzej Garlicki, "Władysława Poboga-Malinowskiego przygody z historią," [Władysław Pobóg-Malinowski's Adventures With History] in Władysław Pobóg-Malinowski, *Najnowsza historia polityczna Polski* [Recent Political History of Poland] Vol. I (Warsaw: Platans, 1990)
- Dariusz Gawin, *Polska, wieczny romans. O związkach literatury i polityki w XX wieku* [Poland, the Eternal Romance. The Relations of Literature and Politics in the 20th Century] (Cracow: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2005)
- Roland Gehrke, *Der Polnische Westgedanke bis zur Wiedererrichtung des Polnischen Staates nach Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges. Genese Und Begründung Polnischer Gebietsansprüche Gegenüber Deutschland Im Zeitalter Des Europäischen Nationalismus* (Marburg: Herder Institut, 2001)
- Bronisław Geremek, *Poverty. A History*, Trans. A. Kołakowska (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994)
- Tomasz Giergiel, "Badania regionalne w historii," [Regional Studies in History] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1998/4.
- Aleksander Gieysztor, Jerzy Maternicki, Henryk Samsonowicz, *Historycy warszawscy ostatnich dwóch stuleci* [Warsaw Historians of the Last Two Centuries] (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1986)
- Michał Głowiński, "PRL-owskie mity i realia," [Myths and Reality of the PRL] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1994/29.
- Aneta Górnicka-Boratyńska, *Stańmy się sobą. Cztery projekty emancypacji (1863-1939)* [Let's Be Ourselves. Four Projects of Emancipation 1863-1939] (Izabelin: Świat Literacki 2002)
- Maciej Górny, *Między Marksem a Palackým. Historiografia w komunistycznej Czechosłowacji* [Between Marx and Palacký. Historiography in the Communist Czechoslovakia] (Warsaw: Trio, 2001)
- Maciej Górny, "Poles in Czech Eyes in the Wake of August 1968," *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs*, 2001/4.
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, "Stalinowski model historiografii," [The Stalinist Model of Historiography] *Dzieje Najnowsze* 1992/3.
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, "The Concept of the Poland of the Piasts in Polish Historiography. Zygmunt Wojciechowski's Interpretation of Poland's History," *Polish Western Affairs*, 1992/2.
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *Historiografia i polityka. Dzieje Konkursu Historycznego im. Juliana Ursyna Niemcewicza 1867-1922* [Politics In Historical Competition of J. U. Niemcewicz 1867-1922] (Warsaw: PIW, 1979)
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *Kształty historii* [The Shapes of History] (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Łódzkie, 1985)
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *Perspektywy przeszłości. Studia i szkice historiograficzne* [Polish Historiography in the 18th-19th Centuries] (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 1983)
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *W kręgu kultu Naczelnika. Rapperswilskie inicjatywy kościuszkowskie (1894-1897)* [On the Kościuszko Cult In the Late 19th-Century] (Warsaw: PIW, 1981)

- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej* [An Outline of the History of Polish Historiography] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2000 and 2003)
- Andrzej Feliks Grabski, *Dzieje historiografii* [History of Historiography] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2003)
- Krzysztof Groniowski, "Seminarium Stefana Kieniewiczza," [The Seminar of Stefan Kieniewicz] *Przegląd Historyczny* 2000/3.
- Jan Tomasz Gross, *Sąsiedzi. Historia zagłady żydowskiego miasteczka. Pamięci Szmulu Wasersztajna*, (Sejny: Pogranicza, 2000) = [Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001)]
- Jörg Hackmann, *Ostpreussen und Westpreussen in Deutscher Und Polnischer Sicht. Landeshistorie als Beziehungsgeschichtliches Problem* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1996)
- Marceli Handelsman, *Historycy. Portrety i Profile* [Historians. Portraits and Profiles] (Warsaw: Księgarnia Ferdynanda Hoesicka, 1937)
- Heiko Haumann, *Historia Żydów W Europie Środkowej I Wschodniej* [History of Central and Eastern European Jews] (Warsaw: 2000)
- Henryk Wereszycki (1898-1990). *Historia w życiu historyka* [Henryk Wereszycki (1898-1990). History in the Life of a Historian] ed. Elżbieta Orman, Antoni Cetnarowicz (Cracow: Historia Iagellonica, 2001)
- Maria Hirszowicz, *Pułapki zaangażowania. Intelktualiści w służbie komunizmu* [Pitfalls of Commitment. Intellectuals Serving Communism] (Warsaw: Scholar, 2001)
- Sybilla Hóldys, *Praktyka Parlamentarna Za Panowania Władysława IV Wazy* [Parliamentary Practice under the Rule of Władysława IV Vasa] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1991)
- Jerzy Holzer, "Historia nie zna bilansów," [History Doesn't Know Balance] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 27 (3 VII 1994)
- Piotr Hübner, "Przebudowa nauk historycznych w Polsce (1947-1953)," [The Reconstruction of Historical Sciences in Poland 1947-1953] *Przegląd Historyczny*, 1987/3.
- Piotr Hübner, *Nauka Polska po II wojnie światowej - idee i instytucje* [Polish Science After WWII, Ideas and Institutions] (Warsaw: COM SNP, 1987)
- Piotr Hübner, *Polityka naukowa w Polsce w l. 1944-1953 Geneza systemu* [Academic Politics in Communist Poland] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1992)
- Magdalena Hułas, "Between Self-Determination and Subordination: The Smaller Powers of East-Central Europe in the Policy of the Big Three," *Bulletin of the International Committee For the History of the World War II*, No 30/31, 1999/2000.
- Ireneusz Ichnatowicz, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la bourgeoisie en Pologne menées apres la Seconde Guerre Mondiale* (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1983)
- Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk 1953-1993* [The History Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, 1953-1993] ed. Stefan K. Kuczyński (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1993)

- Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk 1953-2003* [The History Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, 1953-2003] ed. Stefan K. Kuczyński (Warsaw: IH PAN, 2003)
- Maciej Janowski, "Pitfalls and Opportunities. The Concept of East-Central Europe as a Tool of Historical Analysis," *European Review of History - Revue Européenne d'Histoire*, V. 6 1999/1.
- Maciej Janowski, "Wavering Friendship: Liberal and National Ideas in 19th Century East-Central Europe," *Ab Imperio* 2000 3/4.
- Maciej Janowski, *Polish Liberal Thought Until 1918* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004) [= *Polska myśl liberalna do 1918 roku* (Cracow: Znak, 1998)]
- Maciej Janowski, "Three Historians," *Central European University History Department Yearbook* 2001-2002.
- Robert Jarocki, *Opowieść o Aleksandrze Gieysztorze* [A Story on Aleksander Gieysztor] (Warsaw: Presspublica, 2001)
- Dariusz Jarosz and Maria Pasztor, *W krzywym zwierciadle. Polityka władz komunistycznych w Polsce w świetle plotek i pogłosek z lat 1949-1956* [Politics of the Communist Authorities in the Light of Gossips 1949-1956] (Warsaw: Fakt, 1995)
- Dariusz Jarosz and Maria Pasztor, "La Politique des autorités communistes en Pologne à la lumière des rumeurs dans les années 1949-1953," *Revue Des Etudes Slaves*, V. 71, 1999/2.
- Dariusz Jarosz, "Polish Peasants versus Stalinism," in *Stalinism in Poland 1944-1956. Selected Papers from the Fifth World Congress of Central and East European Studies* (Warsaw: 1995), ed. A. Kemp-Welch (London: Palgrave, 1999)
- Dariusz Jarosz, "How the Polish People Coped With History. Polish History and Problems of National Identity 1944-1989," in *European History: Challenge for A Common Future*, ed. Attila Pók, Jörn Rüsen and Jutta Scherer (Hamburg: Körber Stiftung, 2002)
- Paweł Jasienica [Lech Beynar], *Pamiętnik* [Memories] (Cracow: Znak, 1990)
- Jerzy Jedlicki, "Comment la memoire historique envenime les conflits," *Le Monde Des Débats* 1999/3.
- Jerzy Jedlicki, "Historical Memory as a Source of Conflicts in Eastern Europe," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, V. 32, 1999/3.
- Jerzy Jedlicki, "Poland's Perpetual Return to Europe," *Cross Currents: a Yearbook of Central European Culture* 1993/12.
- Jerzy Jedlicki, "Polish Concepts of Native Culture," in *National Character and National Ideology in Inter-War Eastern Europe*, ed. I. Banac, K. Verdery, (New Haven: Yale Center For International And Case Studies, 1995)
- Jerzy Jedlicki, "Pologne: l'intelligentsia au tournant de l'histoire," *Le Débat Histoire, Politique, Société* 1993/76.
- Jerzy Jedlicki, *A Suburb of Europe. 19th - Century Polish Approaches to Western Civilization* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999)
- Violetta Julkowska, *Retoryka w narracji historycznej Joachima Lelewela* [Rhetorics in the Historical Narration by Joachim Lelewel] (Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM, 1998)

- Tomasz Jurek, "Die Entwicklung eines schlesischen Regionalbewusstseins im Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift Für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, Jg. 47, 1998.
- Tomasz Jurek, "Fremde Ritter im mittelalterlichen Polen," *Questiones Medii Aevi Novae* 1998/3.
- Urszula Kaczmarek, *Dzieje Polaków Na Ziemiach Bułgarskich* [The History of Poles on the Territory of Bulgaria] (Poznań: 1999)
- Urszula Kaczmarek, *Na Węgierskiej Ziemi. Rzecz O Polonii Węgierskiej* [On Hungarian Land. On the Poles in Hungary] (Poznań: 1999)
- Łukasz Kądziera, *Między zdradą a służbą Rzeczypospolitej. Fryderyk Moszyński w latach 1792-1793* [Between the Treason and Republican Duties. Fryderyk Moszyński in the Years 1792-1793] (Warsaw: Volumen, 1993)
- Łukasz Kądziera, "O potrzebie badań nad dziejami Targowicy," [On the Need of Targowica Studies] *Przegląd Historyczny* 1989/2.
- Łukasz Kądziera, "Opcja grodzieńska," [The Grodno Option] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1991/1.
- Igor Kąkolewski, Almut Bues, *Die Testamente Herzog Albrechts von Preussen aus der sechziger Jahren des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999)
- Henryk Kamiński, *Rosja I Europa. Polska. Wstęp Do Badań Nad Rosją i Moskalami* [Russia and Europe. Poland. Introduction to the Research on Russia and the Muscovites] (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1999)
- Wojciech Karpiński, *Polska a Rosja. Z dziejów słowiańskiego sporu* [Poland and Russia. The History of the Slavic Conflict] (Warsaw: PWN, 1994)
- Kazimierz Tymieniecki (1887-1968). *Dorobek i miejsce w mediewistyce polskiej* [Kazimierz Tymieniecki (1887-1968). His Scientific Achievement and Place in Polish Mediaeval Studies] ed. Jerzy Strzelczyk (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Vam, 1990)
- Kaja Kaźmierska, *Doświadczenia wojenne Polaków a kształtowanie się tożsamości etnicznej. analiza narracji kresowych* [War Experiences of the Poles and Development of the Ethnic Identity. Analyse of the Borderlands Narrations] (Warsaw: IFiS PAN, 1999)
- Krystyna Kersten, "Polish Stalinism and the So-Called Jewish Question," in *Der Spät-Stalinismus und die "jüdische Frage"* (Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 1998)
- Krystyna Kersten, *Polacy – Żydzi – Komunizm. Anatomia Półprawd, 1929-1968* [Poles, Jews, Communism. Anatomy of Half-Truths] (Warsaw: Nowa, 1990)
- Krystyna Kersten, "World War II and the Division of Europe," *Bulletin of the International Committee For the History of the World War II*, No 27/28.
- Stefan Kieniewicz, *Historyk a świadomość narodowa* [Historian and National consciousness] (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1982)
- Stefan Kieniewicz, *Joachim Lelewel* (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1990)
- Tomasz Kizwalter, *O nowoczesności narodu. Przypadek polski* [The Modernity of Nation. The Polish Case] (Warsaw: Semper, 1999)

- Tomasz Kizwalter, "National Historiography and its Ideological Conditions (19th - 20th Century)," in *The National Idea as a Research Problem*, ed. Jolanta Sujecka (Warsaw: The Polish Academy of Sciences, The Institute of Slavonic Studies, Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 2002)
- Jerzy Kłoczowski, "Potrzeba nowego spojrzenia na dzieje stosunków polsko-litewskich," [On the Need for a New Interpretation of Polish-Lithuanian Relations] *Lithuania* 1998/1-2.
- Jerzy Kłoczowski, ed., *East Central Europe in the Historiography of the Countries of the Region* (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 1995)
- Jerzy Kłoczowski, *Młodsza Europa: Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia W Kręgu Cywilizacji Chrześcijańskiej Średniowiecza* [Younger Europe. East-Central Europe in the Circle of Medieval Christian Civilization] (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 2003) (First ed. 1984)
- Krystyna Kłosińska, *Ciało, pożądanie, ubranie. O wczesnych powieściach Gabrieli Zapolskiej* [The Body, Desire and Clothes. Early Novels by Gabriela Zapolska] (Cracow: Efra, 1999)
- Kobieta i świat polityki* [Woman and the World of Politics] ed. Anna Żarnowska, Andrzej Szwarc (Warsaw: Dig, 1994)
- Kobieta i kultura czasu wolnego* [Woman and Leisure Culture] ed. Anna Żarnowska, Andrzej Szwarc (Warsaw: Dig, 2001)
- Kobieta i praca. Wiek XIX i XX* [Woman and Labor. 19th and 20th Century] ed. Anna Żarnowska, Andrzej Szwarc (Warsaw: Dig, 2000)
- Ewa Kobylińska and Andreas Lawaty, eds., *Erinnern, Vergessen, Verdrängen. Polnische Und Deutsche Erfahrungen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998)
- Joanna Kochanowicz, *ZMP w terenie. Stalinowska próba modernizacji opornej rzeczywistości* (Warsaw: Trio, 2000)
- Jerzy Kołacki, "Die Tätigkeit der Vertriebenen aus polnischer Sicht – historiographische Erwägungen," in *Verständigung der Deutschen Vertriebenen mit den östlichen Nachbarn. Vergangenheit und Zukunft*, ed. Christof Dahm, (Bonn: Kulturstiftung Der Deutschen Vertriebenen, 1992)
- Kompleks wypędzenia* [The Expelling Complex] eds. Włodzimierz Borodziej, Artur Hajnicz (Cracow: Znak, 1998)
- Adam Koseski ed., *Emigracja Z Ziemi Polskich W XX Wieku. Drogi Awansu Emigrantów* [Emigration from Polish Lands. Directions of the Emigration] (Pułtusk: 1998)
- Piotr Kosiewski and Grzegorz Motyka eds., *Historycy Polscy I Ukraińscy Wobec Problemów XX Wieku* [Polish and Ukrainian Historians in face of the Problems of the 20th Century] (Cracow: 2000)
- Krzysztof Kosiński, *Nastolatki '81. Świadomość młodzieży w epoce "Solidarności"* [Teenagers '81. Youth Identity in the Era of Solidarność] (Warsaw: Trio, 2002)
- Krzysztof Kosiński, *O nową mentalność. Życie codzienne w szkołach 1945-1956* [For a New Mentality. Everyday Life in Schools 1945-1956] (Warsaw: Trio, 2000)

- Tadeusz Kotula, Andrzej Ładomirski, Wiesław Suder, *Starożytne dzieje i kultura. Badacze i badania w Polsce* [The State of the Art in the Research on Ancient History] (Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski, 1995)
- Lech Kowalski, *Kryptonim "Dunaj." Udział Wojsk Polskich w interwencji zbrojnej w Czechosłowacji w 1968 roku* [Operation "Danube". Polish Units in the Intervention in Czechoslovakia 1968] (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1992)
- Władysław Krajewski, "Fakty i mity. O roli Żydów w okresie stalinowskim," [Facts and Myths. On the Role of Jews in the Stalinist Period] *Więź* 1998, Special Issue
- Andrzej Krawczyk, *Praska Wiosna 1968* [Prague Spring 1968] (Warsaw: Volumen, 1998)
- Markus Krzoska, "Die Polnische Geschichtswissenschaft in der Zwischenkriegszeit. Ein Überblick," *Zeitschrift Für Geschichtswissenschaft* 1994/5.
- Markus Krzoska, *Für ein Polen an Oder und Ostsee. Zygmunt Wojciechowski (1900-1955) als Historiker und Publizist* (Osnabrück: Fibre, 2003)
- Markus Krzoska, "Nation und Volk als höchste Werte: Die deutsche und die polnische Geschichtswissenschaft als Antagonisten in der Zwischenkriegszeit," in *Nationalismus und nationale Identität in Ostmitteleuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Bernard Linek, Kai Struve (Marburg: Herder Institut, 2000)
- On Page and Stage. Shakespeare in Polish and World Culture*, ed. Krystyna Kujańska-Courtney (Cracow: Towarzystwo Autorów, 2000)
- Marcin Kula, "Ku jakiej syntezie historii "Solidarności"?" [Which Synthesis of the History of Solidarność?] *Przegląd Historyczny* 2001/2.
- Marcin Kula, "Nieboszczka PRL. Ani dobra, ani mądra, ani piękna, ale skomplikowana," [The Deceased PRL. Neither Good, Nor Wise, Nor Beautiful, But Complicated] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1994 16 X/42.
- Marcin Kula, *Między przeszłością a przyszłością* [Between Past and Future] (Poznań: Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 2004)
- Marcin Kula, *Nośniki pamięci historycznej* [Carriers of Historical Memory] (Warsaw: Dig, 2002)
- Marcin Kula, *Wybór tradycji* [The Selection of Tradition] (Warsaw: Dig, 2003)
- Witold Kula, *Dziennik czasu okupacji* [Diary of the Occupation] ed. Marcin Kula (Warsaw: PIW, 1994)
- Witold Kula, *Rozdziałki* [Notes] (Warsaw: Trio, 1996)
- Witold Kula, *Wokół historii* [On History] (Warsaw: PIW, 1988)
- Joanna Kurczewska, "New Modes of Theorising About Nations and Nationalism (Attempt at An Evaluation)," in *The National Idea As A Research Problem*, ed. Jolanta Sujecka (Warsaw: The Polish Academy of Sciences, The Institute of Slavonic Studies, Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, 2002)

- Gerard Labuda, "Akt von Gnesnen von Jahre 1000. Bericht über die Forschungshaben und Ergebnisse," *Questiones Medii Aevii Novae*, V. 5 2000.
- Gerard Labuda, "Zur Gliederung der slawischen Stämme in der Mark Brandenburg, 10. - 12. Jahrhundert," *Jahrbuch Für Die Geschichte Mittel Und Ostdeutschlands*, V. 42 1994.
- The Last Eyewitness. Children of Holocaust Speak*, ed. Wiktoria Śliwowska (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1998)
- Waldemar Łazuga, *Michał Bobrzyński. Myśl historyczna a działalność polityczna* [Michał Bobrzyński. Historical Thought and Political Activity] (Warsaw: PWN, 1982)
- Krzysztof Lesiakowski, *Mieczysław Moczar, "Mietek." Biografia polityczna* [Mieczysław Moczar. The Political Biography] (Warsaw: Rytm, 1998)
- Lieux du pouvoir au Moyen Age et à l'époque moderne*, ed. M. Tymowski (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1995)
- Herbert Ludat, "Die Deutsch – Polnische Vergangenheit in Marxistischen Sicht," *Zeitschrift Für Ostforschung* 1952/1.
- Herbert Ludat, "Das Sowjetische Geschichtsbild Polens," *Zeitschrift Für Ostforschung* 1952/3.
- Antoni Mączak, *Travel in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995)
- Antoni Mączak, *Nierówna przyjaźń: Układy klientalne w perspektywie historycznej* [Unequal Friendship: Clientelism in the Historical Perspective] (Wrocław: Leopoldinum, 2003)
- Czesław Madajczyk, "1945. Das Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges. Deutschlands Zusammenbruch und Die zweite Wiederherstellung des polnischen Staates," *Nordost-Archiv* Bd 2 1993/1.
- Czesław Madajczyk, "International Trials of War Criminals: Nürnberg and Tokyo. A Comparison and Estimation Half a Century Later," *Bulletin of the International Committee for the History of the World War II*, No 27/28.
- Czesław Madajczyk, *Klerk czy intelektualista zaangażowany? Świat polityki wobec twórców kultury i naukowców europejskich w pierwszej połowie XX wieku* [Clerk or the Committed Intellectual? World Politics and European Authors and Scientists in the First Half of the 20th-Century] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1999)
- Piotr Madajczyk, "Dyskusja w prasie polskiej w latach 1995-96 o transferze Niemców z Polski po 1945 roku," [Discussion in Polish Journals of 1995-96 on the Transfer of Germans after 1945] *Rocznik Polsko-Niemiecki* 1996 Vol. 5.
- Piotr Madajczyk, *Przyłączenie Śląska Opolskiego do Polski 1945-1948* [The Annexing of Opolian Silesia to Poland, 1945-48] (Warsaw: ISP PAN, 1996)
- Halina Manikowska, "La topographie sacrée de la ville, le cas de Wrocław," in *L'antropologie de la ville médiévale – ses aspects matériels et culturels*, ed. Michał Tymowski (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1999)

- Tadeusz Manteuffel, "Warunki rozwoju nauki historycznej w dziesięcioleciu 1948-1958," [Paper Given at the Congress of Polish Historians in 1958], *Przegląd Historyczny* 1995/3-4.
- Wacław Marmon, *Krakowskie środowisko historyczne w latach 1918-1939* [The Cracow Historical Milieu 1918-1939] (Cracow: PTH, 1995)
- Marzec 1968 trzydzieści lat później. Materiały konferencji* [March 1968 30 Years after] ed. Marcin Kula, Piotr Osęka, Marcin Zaremba (Warsaw: PWN, 1998)
- Jerzy Maternicki, "Miejsce i rola *Kwartalnika Historycznego* w dziejach historiografii polskiej," [The Place and role of *Kwartalnik Historyczny* in the History of Polish Historiography] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1989/2.
- Jerzy Maternicki, *Warszawskie środowisko historyczne w okresie II Rzeczypospolitej* [Warsaw Historians Before the War] (Rzeszów: WSP, 1999)
- Jerzy Maternicki, *Wielokształtność historii. Rozważania o kulturze historycznej i badaniach historiograficznych* [The Multiplicity of History. Remarks on Historical Culture and Historiographical Research] (Warsaw: PWN, 1990)
- Zbigniew Mazur, *Antenaci. O politycznym rodowodzie Instytutu Zachodniego* [Ancestors. On the Political Origin of the Western Institute] (Poznań: IZ, 2002)
- Andrzej Mencwel, "Wyzwalanie umysłu. Walicki jest uczonym wybitnym. Teraz każde słowo wymaga uzasadnienia – więc uzasadniam," [The Liberation of the Mind. Walicki Is a Brilliant Scholar. Nowadays Every Word Needs an Explanation – So I Explain] *Kultura* (Supplement To *Polityka* 26 II 1994).
- Henryk S. Michalak, *Józef Szujski 1835-1883. Światopogląd i działanie* [Józef Szujski 1835-1883. Ideology and Activity] (Łódź: Uniwersytet Łódzki, 1987)
- Magdalena Micińska, "The Myth of Tadeusz Kościuszko in the Polish Mind (1794-1997)," *European Review of History - Revue Européenne d'Histoire*, V. 5 1998/2.
- Magdalena Mikołajczyk, *Jak się pisało o historii...Problemy polityczne powojennej Polski w publikacjach drugiego obiegu lat siedemdziesiątych i osiemdziesiątych* [How One Wrote About History... Political Problems of Post-War Poland in the Samizdat Publications of the 1970s and 1980s] (Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1998)
- Eugeniusz Miśiło, *Akcja "Wiśła"* ["Wiśła" Action] (Warsaw: Archivum Ukrainie, 1993)
- Tomasz Moszczyński, "Spór o PRL – dyskusje w *Tygodniku Powszechnym*," [Dispute on the PRL – Discussions in *Tygodnik Powszechny*] in *Polska 1944/45-1989. Studia i Materiały*, 1995
- Grzegorz Motyka, *Akcja "Wiśła,"* [The "Wiśła," Action] (Cracow: 2001)
- Mythes et symboles politiques en Europe Central*, ed. Pierre Chaunu, Michel Maslowski (Paris: PUF, 2001)

- Najnowsze dzieje Żydów w Polsce w zarysie (do 1950 roku)* [The Recent History of Jews in Poland in Outline Till 1950] ed. Jerzy Tomaszewski (Warsaw: PWN 1994)
- The National Idea as a Research Problem*, ed. Jolanta Sujecka (Warsaw: SOW 2002)
- Niemcy w Polsce 1945-1950 – Wybór dokumentów* [Germans in Poland – Selected Documents] eds. Włodzimierz Borodziej, Hans Lemberg, (Warsaw: Neriton, 2000) – many vols. [= “*Unsere Heimat ist uns ein fremdes Land geworden...*” *Die Deutschen östlich von Oder und Neiße 1945-1950. Dokumente aus polnischen Archiven* (Marburg: Herder Institut, 2003-)]
- Stefan Niesiołowski, “Odkłamać historię – dyskusja o PRL,” [Stop Lying About History – Discussion on the PRL] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1992 31 V/22.
- Andrzej Nowak, *Między carem a rewolucją. Studium politycznej wyobraźni i postaw Wielkiej Emigracji wobec Rosji 1831-1849* [Between the Tsar and the Revolution. Study in Political Imaginary of the Great Emigration] (Warsaw-Gdańsk: Gryf-IH PAN, 1994)
- Ofiary czy współwinni. Nazizm i sowietyzm w świadomości historycznej* [Victims Or Co-Responsible. Nazi and Soviet Dictatorships in the Historical Consciousness] ed. Joanna Łukasiak-Miklasz (Warsaw: Fundacja Friedricha Eberta, 1997)
- Henryk Olszewski, “Instytut Zachodni 1944-1994” [The Western Institute, 1944-1994] in *Instytut Zachodni 50 Lat* [50 Years of the Western Institute] ed. Romualda Zwierzycka (Poznań: IZ, 1994)
- Zbigniew Opacki, *Barbaria Rosyjska. Rosja W Historiografii I Myśli Politycznej Henryka Kamińskiego* (Gdańsk: 1993)
- Edward Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587-1652* [Political Culture of the Polish Gentry 1587-1652] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1995)
- Hubert Orłowski, “*Polnische Wirtschaft.*” *Zum deutschen Polendiskurs der Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996) [= “*Polnische Wirtschaft.*” *Nowoczesny niemiecki dyskurs o Polsce* (Olsztyn: Borussia, 1998)]
- Andrzej Paczkowski, “Czarno-białe i biało-czarne, czyli o historii najnowszej historii,” [Black-and-White and White-and-Black or on the History of Contemporary History] *Mówią Wieki* 1993/5.
- Andrzej Paczkowski, “Wojna o PRL,” [The War of the PRL] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1994/32.
- Parlamentaryzm w Polsce we współczesnej historiografii* [Polish Parliamentarism in Contemporary Historiography] ed. Janusz Bardach (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1995)
- Maria Pasztor, “Un lobby en voie d’affaiblissement. L’activité du Groupe Franco- Polonais à l’Assemblée Nationale (1921-1936),” *Revue d’Histoire Diplomatique* 2000/1.

- Bernard Piotrowski, *W służbie nauki i narodu. Instytut Bałtycki w latach 1925-1939* [On Duty for Science and Nation. The Baltic Institute 1925-1939] (Poznań: IZ, 1991)
- Jan M. Piskorski, "Deutsche Ostforschung" und "Polnische Westforschung," *Berliner Jahrbuch Für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 1996/1.
- Polemiki wokół najnowszej historii Polski* [Polemics on the Contemporary History of Poland] ed. Anna Magierska (Warsaw: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1994)
- Polska – Kresy – Polacy. Studia historyczne* [Poland - Borderlands - Poles. Historical Studies] ed. Stanisław Ciesielski (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1994)
- Polska – Niemcy Wschodnie 1945-1990. Wybór dokumentów* [Poland – East Germany 1945-1990] ed. Jerzy Kochanowski, Klaus Ziemer, vol. 1, ed. Andrzej Krajewski, Małgorzata Mazurek (Warsaw: Neriton, 2006)
- Powrót do historii. Europa Środkowa i Wschodnia w historiografii* [Return to History. East-Central Europe in Historiography] ed. Wiesław Balcerak (Warsaw: IH PAN, 1994)
- Kazimierz Z. Poznański, *Poland's Protracted Transition. Institutional Change and Economic Growth, 1970-1994* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- E. Prokop-Janiec, *Międzywojenna Literatura Polsko-Żydowska Jako Zjawisko Kulturowe I Artystyczne* [Inter-war Polish-Jewish Literature as Cultural and Artistic Phenomenon] (Cracow: 1992)
- Jan Prokop, *Pisarze w Służbie Przemocy* [Writers in the Service of Power] (Cracow: Viridis, 1995)
- Jan Prokop, *Sowietyzacja i jej Maski* [Sovietization and its Masks] (Cracow: Viridis, 1997)
- Przesiedlenie ludności polskiej z Kresów Wschodnich do Polski 1944-1947* [Transfer of Polish Population from Eastern Borderlands to Poland 1944-1947], ed. Stanisław Ciesielski (Warsaw: Neriton, 1999)
- Szymon Redlich, *Razem i osobno. Polacy, Żydzi, Ukraińcy w Brzeżanach 1919-1945* [Together and Separately. Poles, Jews and Ukrainians in Brzeżany 1919-1945] (Sejny: Pogranicza, 2002)
- Zbigniew Romek, "Historycy radzieccy o historykach polskich. Uwagi o Zjeździe Wrocławskim i Konferencji Otwockiej," [Soviet Historians on Polish Historians. Remarks on the Wrocław Congress and Otwock Conference] *Polska 1944/45-1989* V.4.
- Zbigniew Romek, "Nauka przeciw ideologii. Współpraca historyków polskich i radzieckich po II wojnie światowej," [The Cooperation of Polish and Russian Historians after WWII] *Dzieje Najnowsze* 2002/1.
- Zbigniew Romek, *Olgierd Górka: historyk w służbie myśli propaństwowej 1908-1955* [Olgierd Górka: the Historian as a Servant of the State Ideology] (Warsaw: Semper, 1997)
- Wojciech Roszkowski, "Wczoraj i dziś," [Yesterday and Today] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1994/40.

- Krzysztof Ruchniewicz, "Spotkania emigracyjnych historyków polskich i historyków zachodnioniemieckich w latach 50. i 60.," [Relations Between Polish Emigrant Historians and Historians from West Germany] *Przegląd Polonijny* 2000/4.
- Krzysztof Ruchniewicz, *Warszawa-Berlin-Bonn. Stosunki polityczne 1949-1958* [Warsaw-Berlin-Bonn. Political Relations 1949-1958] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2003)
- Anetta Rybicka, *Instytut Niemieckiej Pracy Wschodniej. Kraków 1940-1945* (Warsaw: Dig, 2002)
- Hienadź Sahanowicz, *Historia Białorusi Do Końca XVIII Wieku* [History of Belarus Until the End of the 18th Century] (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000)
- Ruta Sakowska, *Menschen im Ghetto. Die jüdische Bevölkerung im Besetzten Warschau 1939-1943* (Osnabrück: Bre, 1999)
- Andrzej Sakson, *Stosunki narodowościowe na Warmii i Mazurach 1945-1997* [Ethnic Relations in Warmia and Mazury 1945-1997] (Poznań: IZ, 1998)
- Stanisław Salmonowicz, "Die Protestantischen Gymnasien in Thorn, Elbing und Danzig und ihre Bedeutung für die regionale Identität in Königliches Preussen (16. – 18. Jahrhundert)," *Nord-Ost Archiv* Bd. 6 1999/2.
- Stanisław Salmonowicz, "Die Wiederherstellung der Religiösen Toleranz in Polen in der Epoche der Aufklärung," *Historische Zeitschrift* Bd 256 1993.
- Stanisław Salmonowicz, "La noblesse Polonaise contre l'arbitraire du pouvoir royal: les privilèges juridiques de la noblesse," *Revue Historique De Droit Français Et Etranger* A. 72 1994/1.
- Stefan Samerski, *Priester im Annektierten Polen. Die Seelsorge Deutscher Geistlicher in den an das Deutsche Reich Angeschlossenen Polnischen Gebieten 1939-1945* (Bonn: 1997)
- Jerzy Serczyk, *25 wieków historii. Historycy i ich dzieła* [25 Centuries of History. Historians and Their Works] (Toruń: UMK, 1994)
- Marian H. Serejski, *Naród a państwo w polskiej myśli historycznej* [Nation and State in Polish Historical Thought] (Warsaw: PIW, 1973)
- Marian H. Serejski, *Historycy o historii. Od Adama Naruszewicza do Stanisława Kętrzyńskiego 1775-1918* [Historians on History. From Adam Naruszewicz to Stanisław Kętrzyński 1775-1918] (Warsaw: PWN, 1966)
- Maciej Serwański, "Les Polonais face à réalité postcommuniste: la "positive" de l'histoire Polonaise dans les manuels scolaires," in *E Explication eu histoire. Problèmes historiographiques et didactiques. Actes du colloque Polonofrançais*, Poznań 19-22 Septembre 1995. eds. Henri Moniot Et De Maciej Serwański, (Poznań: PTPN, 1996)
- P. J. Simmons, *Archival Research on the Cold War Era: A Report from Budapest, Prague and Warsaw, Working Paper of the Project Cold War International History* (Woodrow Wilson International Center For Scholars, May 1992)

- Ryszard Sitek, *Warszawska Szkoła historii idei. Między historią a teraźniejszością* [The Warsaw School of the History of Ideas. Between History and Presence] (Warsaw: Scholar, 2000)
- Jan Skarbek, ed., *Białoruś, Czechosłowacja, Litwa, Polska, Ukraina. Mniejszości w świetle spisów statystycznych XIX i XX wieku. Liczebność i rozmieszczenie – stosunki narodowościowe – polityka narodowościowa* [Belarus, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Poland Ukraine. Minorities in Statistical Survey in the 19th and 20th Century] (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000)
- Skryte oblicze systemu komunistycznego. U źródeł zła* [The Hidden Face of the Communist System. the Origins of Evil] eds. Roman Bäcker, Piotr Hübner, (Warsaw: Dig, 1997)
- Henryk Słabek, "Władza i intelektualiści," [Authorities and Intellectuals] *Dzieje Najnowsze* 2000/2.
- Henryk Słabek, *Intelektualistów obraz własny 1944-1989* [Self-Portraits of Intellectuals, 1944-89] (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1997)
- Michał Śliwa, "Rozrachunki z niedawną przeszłością - współczesne problemy historiografii polskiej," [Settlement With the Past - Contemporary Problems of Polish Historiography] *Przegląd Humanistyczny*, 1994/6.
- Henryk Słoczyński, "Konserwatywna historiografia a prawdziwe źródła stalinizmu, czyli argumenty i medale," [Conservative Historiography and the True Sources of Stalinism: Arguments and Orders] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1999/2.
- Henryk Słoczyński, "Między demonizacją a zmnową milczenia (Józef Szujski i tzw. historycznia szkoła krakowska w ocenach historiografii PRL)," [Between Demonization and Silencing (The Historiography of the PRL-on Józef Szujski and the So-Called Cracow School')] *Arkana* 1998/5.
- Marek Słoń, *Die Spitäl Breslaus im Mittelalter* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2001)
- Tadeusz Sobolewski, "Co zrobić z PRL?," [What to Do With the PRL?] *Tygodnik Powszechny* 1992 19 IV/16.
- Anna Sosnowska, *Zrozumieć zacofanie. Spory historyków o Europę Wschodnią (1947-1994)* [Understanding Backwardness. Historical Debates on Eastern Europe (1947-1994)] (Warsaw: Trio, 2004)
- Paweł Sowiński, *Komunistyczne Święto. Obchody 1. maja w latach 1948-1954* [Communist feast. The 1st of May Celebrations in the years 1948-1954] (Warsaw: Trio, 2000)
- Spółeczeństwo w dobie przemian. Wiek XIX i XX. Księga jubileuszowa profesora Anny Żarnowskiej* [Society in Transition. the 19th and 20th centuries. Festschrift for professor Anna Żarnowska] eds. Maria Nietyksza, Andrzej Szwarc, Katarzyna Sierakowska, Agnieszka Janiak-Jasińska (Warsaw: Dig, 2003)
- Spór o historyczną szkołę krakowską. W stulecie Katedry Historii Polski Uż 1869-1969* [The Debate on the Cracow School] eds. Celina Bobińska, Jerzy Wyrozumski (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1972)

- Spór o niemiecką pamięć. Debata Walser-Bubis* [Walser-Bubis Debate on the German Past] ed. Kazimierz Wóycicki, Piotr Buras (Warsaw: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, 1999)
- Witold Stankowski, "Zur Aussiedlung der Deutschen aus Pommerellen in den Jahren 1945-1950. Ein Forschungsbericht," *Deutsche Studien* Bd. 32, 1995
- Staropolska sztuka wojenna XVI-XVII wieku. Prace ofiarowane profesorowi Jaromiu Maciszewskiemu* [Old-Polish Military History 16th-17th Century] ed. Mirosław Nagielski (Warsaw: Dig, 2002)
- Rafał Stobiecki, "Between Continuity and Discontinuity: A Few Comments on the Post-War Development of Polish Historical Research," *Zeitschrift Für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 2001/2.
- Rafał Stobiecki, *Klio na wygnaniu. Z dziejów polskiej historiografii na uchodźstwie w Wielkiej Brytanii po 1945 r.* [Clio in Exile. From the History of Polish Historiography in Exile in Great Britain after 1945] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2005)
- Rafał Stobiecki, "Spór o interpretacje PRL w publicystyce i historiografii polskiej po 1989 r." [The Dispute on the Interpretations of the PRL in Journalism and in Historiography after 1989] in *Historia. Poznanie. Przekaz*, ed. Barbara Jakubowska (Rzeszów: WSP, 2000)
- Rafał Stobiecki, *Historia pod nadzorem. Spory o nowy model historii w Polsce (II połowa lat czterdziestych – początek lat pięćdziesiątych)* [History Under Control. Debate on the New Model of History in Poland (2nd Half of 1940s – Beginning of 1950s)] (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1993)
- Stanisław Stomma, "Czym była PRL?," [What Was the PRL?] *Tygodnik Solidarność* 16 i 1993.
- Stosunki międzywyznaniowe w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej w XIV-XVII wieku* [Interconfessional Relations in Central and Eastern Europe 14th-17th Century] ed. Marian Dygo, Sławomir Gawlas, Hubert Grala (Warsaw: Dig, 2002)
- Tomasz Stryjek, *Ukraińska Idea Narodowa Okresu Międzywojennego. Analiza Wybranych Koncepcji* [Ukrainian National Idea in the Inter-war Period. Analysis of Selected Conceptions] (Wrocław: Seria Monografie Fundacji na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej, 2000)
- Tomasz Strzembosz, "PRL - państwo zależne," [The PRL - a Dependant State] *Tygodnik Solidarność*, 26 III 1993.
- Tomasz Strzembosz, "Sierp, hackenkreutz i młot," [Sickle, Swastika, and Hammer] *Tygodnik Solidarność* 7 V 1993.
- Andrzej Suchcitz, *Generałowie Wojny Polsko-Sowieckiej 1919-1920* [The Generals of the Polish-Soviet War, 1919-1920] (Białystok: Ośrodek badań hist. wojskowej, 1993)
- Teresa Suleja, "Próby kształtowania "nowego człowieka" w czasach stalinowskich (na przykładzie Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego 1949-1953)," [Attempts

- to Create the "New Man" in Stalinist Times (On the Example of Wrocław University 1949-1953] *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka* 2002/3.
- Teresa Suleja, *Uniwersytet Wrocławski w okresie centralizmu stalinowskiego 1950-1955* [Wrocław University in the Years of Stalinism] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1995)
- Światooglądy historiograficzne* [Historiographical Framing] ed. Jan Pomorski, (Lublin: UMCS, 2002)
- Tomasz Szarota, "1939. Der Anfang des Zweiten Weltkrieges. Deutschlands Expansion und die Zerstörung des polnischen Staates," *Nordost-Archiv* Bd. 2 1993/1.
- Tomasz Szarota, "Der Pole in der deutschen Karikatur (1914-1944). Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung Nationaler Stereotype," in *Nachbarn sind der Rede wert. Bilder der Deutschen von Polen und der Polen von Deutschen in der Neuzeit* (Dortmund: Forschungsstelle Ostmitteleuropa, 1997)
- Tomasz Szarota, "Karikatur und Feinbild als Kampfmittel des antideutschen Widerstandes im Zweiten Weltkrieg," *Ridiculosa. Tyrannie, Dictature et Caricature*, Brest 1997/4.
- Tomasz Szarota, "National Stereotypes as the Theme of Historical Research in Poland," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 1995/ Vol. 71.
- Tomasz Szarota, "Vivre l'histoire ou 'l'histoire vivante': la Seconde Guerre Mondiale dans l'esprit des polonais cinquante ans après," *Bulletin of the International Committee for the History of the World War II*, No 27/28.
- Jenő Szűcs, *Trzy Europy* [Three Europes] (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 1994)
- Zachar Szybieka, *Historia Białorusi 1795-2000* [History of Belarus, 1795-2000] (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2001)
- Środowiska historyczne II Rzeczypospolitej. Materiały konferencji naukowych w Krakowie i Lublinie 1984 i 1985* [Historical Milieus of Inter-War Poland] ed. Jerzy Maternicki, (Rzeszów: WSP, 1986)
- Marek Tarczyński, *Cud Nad Wisłą. Bitwa Warszawska 1920* [Miracle on the Wisła. The Warsaw Battle of 1920] (Warsaw: Instytut Wydawniczy Związków Zawodowych, 1990)
- Janusz Tazbir, "Time in Old Polish Culture," *Dialogue and Humanism* vol. 4., 1993/1
- Janusz Tazbir, "Das Echo auf Die "Entdeckung America" im östlichen Mitteleuropa," *Berliner Jahrbuch für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 1996/1.
- Janusz Tazbir, "Poland: Antemurale or Bridge?" *Dialogue and Universalism* 1999, No 5/6.
- Janusz Tazbir, *Polen an den Wendepunkten der Geschichte* (Herne: Schäfer, 2000)
- Julia Tazbir and Janusz Tazbir, "Jak dzisiaj pisze się podręczniki historii. Co odkłamano, co utrzymano," [How Do We Write a Handbook in History. What Has Changed and Which Lies Keep On Working] *Polityka* 27 III 1993.

- Tematy polsko-litewskie. Historia, literatura, edukacja*, ed. Robert Traba (Olsztyn: Borussia, 1999)
- Daniel Tollet, *Historia Żydów W Polsce Od XVI Wieku do Rozbiorów* [History of the Jews in Poland from the 16th Century to the Partitions] Trans. D. Zamojska (Warsaw: 1999)
- Maria Tomczak, "Borussia – próba wykreowania nowej tradycji regionu" [Borussia – an Attempt To Create a New Tradition of the Region] *Przegląd Zachodni* 1996/4.
- Jerzy Topolski, "Polish Historians and Marxism after W.W.II," *Studies in Soviet Thought* 1992/2.
- Jerzy Topolski, "Polish Historiography and Marxism after WWII," in *Asian and European History in Transitional Period, Collection of Essays in the Celebration on Dr Tae-Young-Lee's Sixtieth Birthday* (Seoul: 1992)
- Jerzy Topolski, *Od Achillesa do Béatrice De Planissolles. Zarys dziejów historiografii* [From Achilles to Béatrice de Planissolles. An Outline of the History of Historiography] (Warsaw: Rytm, 1998)
- Jerzy Topolski, Wojciech Wrzosek, *Miedzy modernizmem a postmodernizmem. historiografia wobec zmian w filozofii historii* [Between Modernism and Postmodernism. Historiography Facing Changes of the Philosophy of History] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1994)
- Tomasz Torbus, *Die Konventsburgen im Deutschordensland Preussen* (München: Oldenbourg, 1998)
- Robert Traba, "Konstrukcja i proces dekonstrukcji narodowego mitu. Rozważania na podstawie analizy semantycznej polskich obchodów rocznic grunwaldzkich w XX wieku," [The Construction and the Process of the Deconstruction of National Myth. Deliberations on the Semantic Analysis of the Polish Public Festivities of the Anniversaries of the Battle of Grunwald (Tannenberg) in the 20th Century] *Komunikaty Warmińsko-Mazurskie* 1999/4.
- Robert Traba, "Regionalna Czy Narodowa?" [Regional or National?] *Borussia* 1993/6.
- Robert Traba, *Historia – przestrzeń dialogu* [History – the Space of the Dialogue] (Warsaw: ISP PAN, 2006)
- Robert Traba, *Wschodniopruskość. Tożsamość regionalna i narodowa w kulturze politycznej Niemiec* [Eastprussianness. Regional and National Identity in the German Political Culture] (Poznań-Warsaw: PTPN, 2006)
- Trudna tożsamość. Problemy narodowe i religijne w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej w XIX i XX wieku* [Difficult Identity. National and Religious Problems in East-Central Europe 19th and 20th Century] ed. Jan Lewandowski (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000)
- Jacek Trznadel, *Hańba domowa* [Civil Shame] (Lublin: Test, 1990)
- Marian Turski, "Dzieje wstydlive" [Shameful History] *Polityka* 9 IV 1994.
- Maciej Tymiński, *PZPR i przedsiębiorstwo. Nadzór partyjny nad zakładami przemysłowymi 1956-1970* [PZPR and the Firm. Party Control over the Industrial Enterprises] (Warsaw: Trio, 2001)

- Bożena Umińska, *Postać z cieniem. Portrety Żydówek w polskiej literaturze od końca XIX wieku do 1939 roku* [The Figure with the Shadow. Jewish Women Portraits in Polish Literature Late 19th Century-1939] (Warsaw: Sic!, 2001)
- Bogdan Urbankowski, *Czerwona Msza, Albo Uśmiech Stalina* [The Red Mass or Stalin's Smile] (Warsaw: Alfa, 1998)
- Elizabeth Valkenier, "Sovietization and Liberalization in Polish Postwar Historiography," *Journal of Central European Affairs* 1959/2.
- Bogdan Wachowiak, "Das Handbuch der Preussischen Geschichte aus polnischer Sicht," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel und Ostdeutschlands* Bd. 43, 1995.
- Bogdan Wachowiak, "Die Allgemeinen Hintergründe der Wirtschaftlichen und Sozialen Entwicklung Pommerns. Ost und Mittelpreuens in den ersten Dezenien des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte* 1994/2.
- Bogdan Wachowiak, "Elemente und Formen der Bauernbefreiung in den östlichen Provinzen Preussens am Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Berliner Jahrbuch für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 1996/1.
- Sławomira Walczewska, *Damy, rycerze, feministki. Kobiety dyskursu emancypacyjnego w Polsce* [Ladies, Knights, Feminists. Women's Emancipatory Discourse in Poland] (Warsaw: eFka, 2000)
- Andrzej Walicki, "Czy PRL była państwem totalitarnym?" [Was PRL a Totalitarian State?] *Polityka* 21 VII 1990.
- Andrzej Walicki, *Poland between the East and the West. The Controversies over Self-Definition and Modernization in Partitioned Poland* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994)
- Andrzej Walicki, *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989)
- Andrzej Walicki, *Zniewolony umysł po latach* [Captive Mind after Years] (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1993)
- Piotr Wandycz, "Spór o PRL," [The Dispute on the PRL] *Kultura* 1995/1-2.
- Roman Wapiński, *Historia polskiej myśli politycznej XIX i XX wieku* [History of Polish Political Thought] (Gdańsk: Arche, 1997)
- Wątki polityczne w pracach Marii i Stanisława Ossowskich* [Political Webs in the Works of Maria and Stanisław Ossowski] ed. Olgierd Sochacki (Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1999)
- Węgry – Polska w Europie Środkowej. Historia – literatura. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora Wacława Felczaka* [Hungary – Poland in Central Europe. History – Literature. Festschrift for Professor Wacław Felczak] ed. Antoni Cetnarowicz, Csaba Gyula Kiss and István Kovács (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu, 1997)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, "Wokół "czarnej legendy" historiografii krakowskich konserwatystów," [On the "Legende Noir" of Cracow Conservative Historiography] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1997/2.

- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Groźni i wielcy. Polska myśl historyczna XIX i XX wieku wobec rosyjskiej despotii* [The Terrible and the Great. Polish Historical Thought of the 19th and 20th Centuries and Russian Despotism] (Warsaw: Sic!, 2001)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Historiografia polska doby romantyzmu* [Polish Romantic Historiography] (Wrocław: Leopoldinum, 1999)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Konstytucja 3 Maja w historiografii polskiej* [The Constitution of 3rd May in Polish Historiography] (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1993)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Naród – państwo w polskiej myśli historycznej dwudziestolecia międzywojennego* [Nation and State in Polish Historical Thought of the Inter-War Period] (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1978)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Spory o polską duszę. Z zagadnień charakterologii narodowej w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX w.* [Debates on the Polish Soul. On National Characterology in Polish Historiography in the 19th and 20th Centuries] (Warsaw: Neriton, 1993)
- Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Wschód-Zachód w koncepcjach dziejów Polski* [East and West in the Interpretations of Polish History] (Warsaw: PIW, 1984)
- Piotr Wróbel, "Neighbours Reconsidered," *The Polish Review*, Vol. XLVI/2001/4.
- Wojciech Wrzesiński, "Problem kształcenia historyków polskich u progu wieku XXI," [The Problem of the Education of Polish Historians at the Turn of the Century] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 1997/4.
- Wojciech Wrzesiński, "Stan i potrzeby historii najnowszej w Polsce," [The State of the Art and the Current Needs of Contemporary History in Poland] *Nauka* 1997/1.
- Wojciech Wrzosek, "Metamorfozy metafor. Historiografia nieklasyczna w kręgu epistemologii historii," [The Metamorphosis of Metaphors. Non-Classical Historiography and Historical Epistemology] *Historyka. Studia Metodologiczne*, 1994.
- Wojciech Wrzosek, *Historia – kultura – metafora. Powstanie nieklasycznej historiografii* [History – Culture – Metaphor. The Creation of Non-Classical Historiography] (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1995)
- Andrzej Wyczański, *Między kulturą a polityką. Sekretarze królewscy Zygmunta Starego (1506-1548)* (Warsaw: PWN, 1990)
- Andrzej Zahorski, *Spór o Stanisława Augusta* [Historiographical Controversies over the Last King of Poland] (Warsaw: PIW, 1988)
- Gwidon Zalejko, "Soviet Historiography as a "Normal Science,"" in *Historiography between Modernism and Post-Modernism. Contributions to the Methodology of Historical Research*, ed. Jerzy Topolski, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994)
- Marcin Zaremba, "Próba legitymizacji władzy komunistycznej w latach 1944-1947 poprzez odwołanie się do treści narodowych" [An Attempt at the Legitimization of the Communist Power through Relating to the National Values] *Polska 1944/45-1989* T. 2/1997.

- Marcin Zaremba, *Komunizm, legitymizacja, nacjonalizm. Nacjonalistyczna legitymizacja władzy komunistycznej w Polsce* [Communism, Legitimization, Nationalism. Nationalistic legitimization of the Communist Power in Poland] (Warsaw: Trio, 2001)
- Hanna Zaremska, *Les bannis au moyen age* (Paris: Aubier, 1996)
- Anna Żarnowska, "Geschichte der Arbeiterklasse und der Arbeiterbewegung. Ein Umschau der Forschungsproblematik im letzten Jahrzehnten," in *Zur Arbeiterschaft und Arbeiterbewegung in Polen* (Bochum: Isb, 1993)
- Janusz Żarnowski, "Arbeiter und Nationalismus in Polen vom Ende des 2. Weltkrieges bis in die Gegenwart," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 1994/2.
- Janusz Żarnowski, "Professions in Modern Eastern Europe," *Giessener Abhandlungen zur Agrar-und Wirtschaftsforschung des Europäischen Ostens*, V. 207, Berlin 1995.
- Wacław Zarzycki, *Biskup Adam Naruszewicz (1733-1796). Luminarz polskiego Oświecenia* [Bishop Adam Naruszewicz (1733-1796). The Enlightened Luminary] (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 1999)
- Klaus Zernack, "Schwerpunkte und Entwicklungslinien der polnischen Geschichtswissenschaften nach 1945," *Historische Zeitschrift* 1973 Sonderheft 5;
- Klaus Zernack, *Zwischen Kritik und Ideologie. Methodologische Probleme der polnischen Historikerkongreß in Breslau 1948* (Köln-Graz: 1964)
- Klaus Zernack, "Die Entwicklung der polnischen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945," in *Die Interdependenz von Geschichte und Politik in Osteuropa seit 1945. Historiker – Fachtagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Osteuropakunde e. V., Berlin Vom 9. -11. 6. 1976 in Bad Wiessee. Protokoll*, ed. Günther Stökl
- Benedykt Zientara, *Heinrich der Bärtige und seine Zeit. Politik und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Schlesien* (München: Oldenbourg, 2001)
- Władysław Zientara, *Sarmatia Europiana oder Sarmatia Asiana? Polen an der deutschsprachigen Druckwerken des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2001)
- Robert Zuzowski, "The Impact of Nationalism on Communism: the Case of Poland," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, 1992, No 1-2.
- Andrzej Zybertowicz, *Między dogmatem a programem badawczym. Problemy stosowania materializmu historycznego we współczesnej historiografii polskiej* [Between Dogma and Research Agenda. Problems of the Usage of Historical Materialism in Contemporary Polish Historiography] (Warsaw-Poznań: PWN, 1990)
- Paweł Żmudzki, "Spór o analizę strukturalną podań i mitów dotyczących 'początku' Polski (na marginesie książek Jacka Banaszkiewicza i Czesława Deptuły)," [The Debate on the Structural Analysis of Myths Concerning the 'Beginnings' of Poland] *Przegląd Historyczny* 4/2002

Pavel Kolář and Michal Kopeček

A Difficult Quest for New Paradigms: Czech Historiography after 1989

In today's history of historiography, it is customary to say that the narratives historians produce are deeply indebted to their political, social and cultural environment, so that a historian of historiography is supposed to take into account various conditions from institutions and local traditions to the main currents of thought and discourses of the time. In order to be able to do this, he or she must have detailed linguistic and textual knowledge of the historian, school or current studied; at the same time, he or she also has to have a thorough knowledge of the period 'as a whole,' constructing a broader, indispensable context around the specific object of study. Yet, when one writes an essay on the historiography of the most recent past, two considerations must be made. First, the historian him- or herself is very much within the intellectual currents and traditions he or she is about to examine. This makes any detached analysis difficult; instead, it is easy to descend into polemic. Second, given the freshness of the studied phenomenon, no long-term perspective is available from which it can be seen which historiographical currents or schools become successful and which do not. The historian of contemporary historiography is less capable of separating 'real'—because successful—history production from 'garbage,' simply because it is not clear yet who the winners are. That is why we can admire Bloch and Febvre as the grand heroes of the story of historiography in the 20th century and forget or despise so many of the political historians of the Sorbonne they were combating. However, it would be hardly possible to understand the revolution without taking the reactionary party into account.¹ These factors we have to bear in mind when discussing Czech historiography in the years after the upheavals of 1989.

Originally, this study was proposed as an overview of main works and currents in Czech historical studies after 1989, as a sort of *Forschungsbericht* without far-reaching interpretative claims. As work went on, however, it became obvious that the forms, themes and methods of the historiography under discussion follow certain firm lines. The paradigm from before 1989 survives alongside new paths of historical studies. Reflecting on this brought four sets of problems to light; our essay is organized around these.

In the first place, we take a look at shifts in objects and fields of research. Generally, the political changes of 1989 brought an extraordinary expansion of research areas, especially in modern history, where a large number of taboos were broken. At the same time, some themes intensely studied before 1989 fell into disgrace. Also, as we shall argue, the introduction of new *objects* of research did not necessarily mean an introduction of new *problems*.

Second, how it dealt (whether in programmatic essays or in empirical works) with the legacy of Marxism-Leninism that had dominated the discipline before was crucial for the historical profession after 1989. How deep-rooted did the Marxist-Leninist paradigm prove to be after 1989? Did it perish, together with the official ideology, or did it prove to be more durable, especially as a particular 'mode of thought' beyond the ideological?

Third, we focus on the new approaches of Czech historians to fill in the gaps created by the fall of Marxism-Leninism. What approaches, currents or schools of history from abroad did they look up to, what older domestic traditions did they refresh? How were these 'imports' or 'recoveries' reinterpreted and adapted to the new conditions after 1989?

Fourth, the development of Czech historical scholarship, as in the whole of East Central Europe, was heavily determined by the rehabilitation of the nation-state and its legitimacy. To what extent has the paradigm of nation-centered history, which had lasted more or less through the whole period of Communist dictatorship, been put in question, and to what extent has it been cemented in the empirical works of historians? Have there been attempts to go beyond and beneath the nation as the dominant frame of reference of historical research, i.e., to employ trans-national or sub-national perspectives?

In what follows, we shall concentrate upon Czech historical writings as they faced these challenges while addressing their special sub-

jects, be it the impact of the Black Death in the Middle Ages or the origins of the 'Velvet Revolution' of 1989. Our objective is twofold. On the one hand, we intend to review the range of studies done. On the other hand, we want to point out some common denominators in historiography in its entirety: we look at the historiography of the period after 1989 as a dynamic process in which, notwithstanding the changes in ideological prescriptions and political conditions, old paradigms have clashed with new ones. Consequently, here and there, our work takes the form of documentary more than of analysis—and vice versa. In structuring our account, we chose a conventional key, classifying historical writings—after a brief discussion of their institutional conditions—into chronological sections ranging from the Middle Ages to contemporary history. It would have been, of course, interesting to look at thematically defined areas of research as well, such as political, social, economic etc. history throughout all historical periods, and thus to put more emphasis on methodical and conceptual aspects. The chronological key is more appropriate, however, since the barriers between chronologically defined sections are still much lower than those in the case of other kinds. The relationship between the political and the cultural histories of the early-modern period is still much closer than that between the economic history of the early-modern period and contemporary economic history.

Our purpose here is not to provide an overall interpretation of Czech historiography after 1989, adhering to some of the latest concepts in the history of historiography.² This will hopefully be done in future monographs. We do not attempt at a semiotic analysis focusing on the metaphors and figures with the help of which a coherent story is made out of 'historical facts.' Similarly, we do not follow Pierre Bourdieu's approach. That is, we do not analyze the 'disciplinary field' of Czech historical scholarship in terms of a struggle for the truth within the discipline, looking at power relations and the distribution of symbolic capital. Rather, this study can be understood as an outline of intellectual, institutional and societal developments in historiography, as a first step towards such analytical monographs to come.

With regard to the title of our essay, we have to bear in mind that, naturally, it is highly problematic to construct a general paradigm that would determine the entire historical discipline by means of a uniform 'mode of thought.' Indeed, the real situation is the coexistence and

competition of different patterns, even under massively homogenizing conditions of dictatorship. Therefore, no sudden 'paradigm shift' can be empirically identified. The period after 1989 was one in which the discursively construed distinction between 'old' and 'new' was sharper than ever; at the same time, traditional patterns and mentalities subliminally continued to shape new historical writings. It is this fundamental contradiction we tried to focus on in the first place.

1. INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS

In recent years, historians of historiography have paid increased attention to the institutions in which historical works were produced, methodological skills inculcated, and the flow of historical knowledge to the public secured.³ These institutions—university chairs, Academy Institutes, but also historical congresses and scholarly journals—shaped the discipline and gave it its social dimension. Under the Communist dictatorships, these institutions expanded in order to support the homogenizing objectives of the ruling ideology.⁴ At the same time, the institutions themselves, and the historians who worked there, were able to adapt themselves to the new conditions and to lead a constant dialogue with 'power.' By no means can it be argued that these institutions had been forced into line before 1989.⁵ At the same time, it would be foolish to deny the deep rupture of 1989.

Generally speaking, numerous reforms were undertaken with regard to both the structure and the capacity of academic institutions after 1989. This meant, in the first place, a fundamental demotion of the Czechoslovak Academy of Science and a parallel establishment of new universities, primarily outside the traditional centers of academic research, i.e., Prague, Brno and Olomouc. This effort to decentralize historical research, however, met with state budget limits as well as with a rivalry between individual departments and faculties. The attempts at closer co-operation between universities and the Academy of Science did not bring much success either. In terms of teaching and research personnel, the return of historians excluded or fired from academic institutions during the purges of the so-called normalization era following the Soviet occupation of the country in 1968 was the most important event. Still, the lack of qualified young staff with research or teaching experience from abroad proved to be a great difficulty; the

large generation gap was bridged only towards the end of the 1990s. Finally, the traditional lack of *peregrinatio academica*, i.e., migration of intellectual potential between various centers of historical scholarship, has not been relieved. Thus, an overwhelming majority of Czech historians continued their career at the same university where they had studied, which makes exchange of ideas more difficult.

The development of historical studies at universities has been characterized by two general processes: first, the reconstruction of established universities (Prague, Brno, Olomouc), and second, the proliferation of new universities and faculties outside these centers. In their reform efforts, the universities had to come to terms with residues common to most Eastern European countries, among which the centralization of the institutional structure, the separation of research from teaching and the authoritarian style of instruction proved to be the most durable.

Moreover, in historical studies, these deformations proved to be even more striking than elsewhere. Both the institutional and the intellectual consequences of these phenomena were far-reaching. However, no consequent transformation of the historical teaching system and curricula has in fact taken place after 1989. In the first place, the form of instruction preserved a great deal of its shortcomings from before 1989. A high number of semester and annual exams and the absence of dialogical pedagogical styles are the most striking problems. Another deficiency is related to the instruction of young academic staff: there have been only a limited number of research-oriented Ph.D. seminars and other types of academic teamwork (a comparison would be with the German system of *Graduiertenkollegs*) that would support innovation. The structure of departments and institutes does not correspond to the demands of contemporary research either. Especially the traditional departmental division between General and Czech history, dating back to the 19th century, seems obsolete. Because of this institutional conservatism, the promotion of new branches such as new social and cultural history, gender history, historical anthropology or comparative history is hindered considerably.

At Charles University of Prague, before 1989, historical studies had been confined to the Philosophical and Pedagogical Faculties. As far as the former is concerned, certain reforms concerning the department structure have been undertaken.⁶ Yet, while this transformation brought some reform in the area of research, no profound

change has taken place in the sphere of teaching. Independently of the Philosophical Faculty, new faculties were founded that gave some room to historical studies. At the Faculty of Social Sciences, the Institute of International Studies was founded, housing 'area studies' departments with a strong focus on historical research and interdisciplinarity.⁷ At the Faculty of Humanities, an M.A. program in historical anthropology was initiated, as well as an M.A. course in gender studies with a strong historical focus. Similarly, at the University in Pardubice, M.A. courses in historical anthropology and gender history were introduced.

At Masaryk University of Brno, the original Department of History, Archival Studies, and Ethnography was transformed in 1991 into the Institute of History, after the auxiliary disciplines and ethnography had been given their own departments.⁸ Politically persecuted professors such as Jaroslav Marek and Jaroslav Mezník rejoined the Institute's staff. Nevertheless, in Brno, just as in the University of Olomuc (another older university), the faculties devoted to historical studies preserved the old curricula from before 1989 and left only a limited space for new themes and approaches. Certain developments took place at new historical departments of regional universities with a high level of regional specialization.⁹

Both before and after 1989, the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences has been the most important institution of historical research outside of the universities. Under the Communist dictatorship, the Institute was one of those academic institutions that were designed to serve the ideological needs of the Communist Party. This is why the Institute's research heavily concentrated on modern and contemporary history, whereas medieval and early-modern history was disregarded. After 1989, the Institute went through several organizational changes. In 1990, František Šmahel, one of the most respected students of medieval history in Czechoslovakia, took control of the Institute; thus, research emphasis shifted towards earlier historical epochs. Moreover, after the founding of the Institute of Contemporary History of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences 1990, the Institute's research area was confined to the period before 1945. In 1990, it was reorganized into four research departments specializing in the Middle Ages, early-modern history, and the 19th and the 20th centuries. In 1994 and 1998, the internal structure of the Institute was further reorganized.¹⁰ Notwithstanding these permanent transformations and the

high number of research staff, the Academy Institute has undergone a process of considerable intellectual ossification and has become, at least as far as modern history is concerned, a fortress of the traditional, event-oriented historiography, hostile to innovation in both methods and research fields.

As was mentioned above, research on contemporary history came within the competence of the Institute of Contemporary History of the Academy of Sciences founded in early 1990s as a common project of the Academy of Sciences and the History Commission of the Civic Forum (Občanské forum).¹¹ From its very beginning, the Institute's major goal was the study of Czechoslovak history from the end of the 1930s to the present. The framework of the Institute's activities has been embodied by several research projects focusing on the establishment of the Communist dictatorship, the crisis of 1967–1970, the upheavals of 1989 and the activities of the State Security Service between 1969 and 1989. The Institute's research orientation seemed to be, to a large extent, under the sway of the political climate dominant in Czech society in the first half of the 1990s, heavily indebted to a simplified concept of totalitarianism.¹²

The scene of Czech historical periodicals is also marked both by continuity and discontinuity. On the one hand, leading journals of the former period continue to represent the mainstream of Czech historical writing. *Český časopis historický* (Czech Historical Review) remains the main journal publishing contributions of various chronological and thematic specialization. Two other very important journals, *Časopis matice moravské* (Moravian Foundation Review), specializing in the history of Moravia but also publishing more general articles, and *Časopis českého muzea* (Czech Museum Review) also embody the continuity of Czech historiography. From among the journals existing before 1989, *Slovanský přehled* (Slavonic Review), focusing on East European history and culture, and *Folia Historica Bohemica*, specializing in early-modern history, have been published after 1989 as well.

Besides the older journals, new historical periodicals have been founded—in order to fill in gaps rather than to challenge the historical mainstream. Among them, the most important are *Soudobé dějiny* (Contemporary History), published by the Institute of Contemporary History, *Mediavalia historica bohemica*, specializing in medieval history, and *Opera historica*, published by the historical institute of the univer-

sity in České Budějovice, concentrating on the social and everyday life history of the early-modern period. It is, however, important to note that no historical journal has emerged that would fundamentally question the established tradition of Czech historical scholarship and thus play a role similar to that of, say, *Annales* in France, *Past and Present* in Great Britain, *Quaderni Storici* in Italy or *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* in Germany. It is remarkable that the debates about controversial issues have to a large extent taken place on the pages of popular historical journals. The most important of these, *Dějiny a současnost* (Past and Present), stopped appearing in 1969 and restarted its activity in 1990.

To sum up: Czech history institutions had to carry on an uneasy struggle with the burden of the past. In general, the old traditional historical institutions, within or outside universities, have been capable of profound reform that would have facilitated intellectual innovation only to a limited degree. By contrast, the newly established institutions proved to be more open to new approaches and areas of research. Whereas the traditional philosophical faculties experienced intellectual stagnation, new branches such as area studies, historical anthropology and gender history successfully develop at newly established faculties with more modern curricula and younger teaching staff. As newcomers, however, they have mostly played second fiddle when it came to the distribution of resources.

Our general contention is that the institutional background of Czech historical scholarship did not support the paradigm shift in historical studies. Rather, central institutions have functioned more as constraints on the introduction of new approaches that emerged in Western scholarship during the 1980s and 1990s. Given these institutional preconditions, Czech historiography—despite leaving Marxist-Leninist ideology behind—has largely relied on traditional positions from the 1950s and 1960s, that is, on the traditional paradigm, or, more precisely, a blend of several paradigms. Besides the institutional framework, this dominance was also shaped by a certain *habitus* of Czech historians, going back to the times of the Institute of Austrian Historical Research (*Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*), which had been formative for the emerging Czech historical scholarship in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and continued being so indirectly even after 1918. This involves, first, a commitment to ‘pure’ scholarship and a refusal of any theoretical reflection, resulting in the understanding of the historian’s

enterprise as positivistic fact-collecting. Second, it implies insistence on an essentialist concept of the truth, which facilitated the inflow of moralism into historical study. Third, national history, not seriously challenged even by the Marxist concept of class before 1989, remained the principal point of departure in historical writings throughout all periods. Although the generation of the 1960s sought to break with this tradition, the events of 1968 destroyed these new developments for at least one generation. After 1989, old problems surfaced again under new conditions of international scholarship.

2. MAIN TRENDS IN MEDIEVAL HISTORY

With regard to methodological 'renewal' in Czech medieval studies, coming to terms with the dominant doctrine of historical materialism was of primary importance. Yet it is important to point out that no 'purely' Marxist-oriented study of the Middle Ages ever took the lead in empirical research. Naturally, even the most important Marxist scholars were never absolutely deaf to other methodological approaches, not even in the 1950s. As early as in the 1960s, an important part of Czech medieval studies was deeply influenced by the French *Annales* school. This applies primarily to František Graus and Josef Macek, as well as, from among the younger generation, František Šmahel and Josef Válka. Hence, a renewal of the interest in the *Annales* school and other progressive directions could have been expected after 1989. Yet, no such a boom of *Annales*-reception took place in the 1990s; the fall of the Marxist paradigm was followed by a high level of methodological diversity.

Thus, in František Šmahel's and Jaroslav Marek's reflection on the impact of the *Annales* school upon Czech historical scholarship from the 1930s onwards¹³ no single *Annales*-inspired work on the Middle Ages appearing after 1989 is mentioned. Also, significantly, the Czech edition of Jacques Le Goff's *La Civilisation de l'Occident médiéval* is cherished as the most important event in the Czech reception of the *Annales*. Although Šmahel and Marek argue that the *Annales* school is still playing a primary role in Czech medieval studies, no example, other than a list of translations, backs this claim.¹⁴

Josef Válka includes more *Annales*-inspired works of paradigmatic value in his account of the impact of 'la nouvelle histoire' on Czech

historiography, most notably Josef Macek's "The Jagellonian Age in the Bohemian Lands",¹⁵ František Šmahel's "Hussite Revolution",¹⁶ Josef Petráň's "History of Material Culture"¹⁷ and Jaroslav Mezník's "Prague on the Eve of the Hussite Revolution".¹⁸ Válka maintains that the Czech historiography of the 1970s and 1980s cannot be simply called 'Marxist,' since the reception of *nouvelle histoire* was not insignificant. However, he seems to overlook the dynamic of the *Annales* school itself: although he points out some changes over the previous decade in consequence of globalization, such as the revival of national history and biography, he limits the *Annales* school to Braudel's generation of the 1950s and 1960s. Thus, he equates the Czech reception of the *Annales* school as such with the reception of works from the 1950s and 1960s:

The editions of *Annales*-inspired books in the 1990s prove that Czech historiography entered the post-November period [i.e., the period following the upheavals of November 1989, P.K. and M.K.] without being forced to change any of its principles that had been developing since the second half of the 1950s. To call research on older Czech history before 1989 Marxist is a crude simplification. It is a paradox that historical scholarship in the sense of *nouvelle histoire* experienced its greatest development in the time of 'normalization,' thanks both to historians remaining in the official structures as well as those excluded from those.¹⁹

Hence, Válka sees the main task of the next *Annales*-inspired generation of historians in copying what the third *Annales*-generation did, namely, devising "a synthetic account of the key fields of Czech history." But in effect Válka subsumes all work deviating either from traditional political-event-oriented history or from dogmatic Marxism-Leninism (such as modern economic, social and cultural history or the history of the labor movement) under *nouvelle histoire*. Be this as it may, looking at the studies published in the leading Czech history journals, including the one specializing in the history of the Middle Ages, *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*, one can hardly notice a significant mark left by *nouvelle histoire*. On the contrary, more or less traditional constitutional, administrative and regional history has been dominating Czech medieval studies in these periodicals since 1990.

In terms of research themes, medieval studies was overwhelmingly characterized by new discussions of old topics. Traditionally, the Hussite movement and the history of the 15th century in general were the most typical subjects of Czech medieval studies. This goes right back to the origins of Czech historical scholarship in the 19th century, as the Hussite movement constituted the most important *topos* in the grand narrative of the Czech national movement. After 1918, this predominance was only strengthened with the Hussite movement advancing to the center of the symbolic system of the new nation-state. The same happened after 1945 and 1948, when the 'Hussite revolutionary tradition' was taken up by the Communist Party as the crucial element of its historical ideology, containing both social and ethnic-national components. Finally, the Hussite movement attracts attention within general European history as the historical event with the largest repercussions.

The discussions after 1989 had to come to terms with a large and multi-layered research landscape. First of all, numerous non-dogmatic Marxist approaches from the 1960s had to be reexamined. In this respect, the edition of František Šmahel's *magnum opus*, the four-volume "Hussite Revolution" remains the most important event in Czech Hussite research in the 1990s. Šmahel's work is a polemic with the Marxist tradition, but by no means a one-sided one. In Šmahel's words:

This work came to life as a critical discourse with the Marxist conception of Hussite history. But criticism alone is not negation. Substituting one one-sidedness with another is but a narrowing of knowledge. (...) Hussitism has always been part of general history for me, and that was the reason why I consciously gave up searching for its 'Meaning' for Czech history.²⁰

In contrast to Válka, who, as we have seen, disclaimed the label 'Marxist,' Šmahel pays respect to the Marxist research on Hussitism for having introduced the concept of feudalism into medieval studies as well as for fruitful debates on the so-called 'crises of feudalism in the 14th century' which, inspired by British Marxist historians such as Rodney Hilton, identified the connection between the social structure of the movement, its ideology and the goals of its various competing groups.

Šmahel pays tribute to the three leading Marxist students of the Hussite movement in the 1950s and 1960s: Josef Macek, for pointing out the competition between two different social groups (burghers and the gentry) within the Hussite movement; František Graus, for underlining the importance of the transition to money rent and the emergence of towns; and, finally, Robert Kalivoda, for stressing the proto-capitalist aspects of the Hussite movement and for characterizing it as an “early bourgeois revolution.”²¹ However, Šmahel refused to adhere to any overall explanatory model and preferred an eclectic approach that included several plausible perspectives. Subsequently, in his latest work, he disdains “methodological innovations” in favor of depicting “the human fates of both individuals and communities.” Thus, despite his claim that he prefers problems to chronological account, traditional narrative makes up the greater part of the volume.²² Šmahel’s revelation of the Hussite revolution as a part of general or *total history* (Jacques Le Goff) or as a part of the early phase of European Reformation seems to be its only major interpretative contribution.

Like in other fields of Czech historical scholarship, new editions of *libri prohibiti* originally published before 1968 or written during the ‘normalization era’ of the 1970s and 1980s entered the debates after 1989. The most important among these was the new edition of Robert Kalivoda’s ‘Hussite Ideology’ under the new title “Hussite Thought”. The first edition of 1961 was enriched by Kalivoda’s concluding chapter “European Feudalism and the ‘bürgerlich’ Phenomenon”, in which he abandons the framework of ‘national history’ and sums up his conclusions in a broad philosophical-historical perspective. Kalivoda’s work is the last attempt in Czech historiography to approach the Hussite question from a non-dogmatic Marxist perspective. As is common in dealing with original Marxist views after 1989, the re-edition has not aroused any significant debate in the community of historians.²³

Undoubtedly, concerning the period following the Hussite movement, the most notable publishing achievement was the publication of Josef Macek’s “The Jagellonian Era in the Bohemian Lands” a four-volume counterpart to Šmahel’s opus. It is a master account encompassing all spheres of political, social and cultural life, combining Marxist approaches (Macek insists on the concept of class) with new perspectives focusing on mentalities, ideologies and culture.²⁴ In his introduction to the first volume, criticizing traditional accounts of 19th-century histori-

ography, he refuses to confine his work to the accumulation of unknown facts in favor of an entirely new view of the period:

[T]his book is an attempt to grasp the key economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and mental phenomena of those 55 years in their entirety and to reconstruct them both in terms of their antagonisms and unity. Whereas Palacký and Tomek concentrated on details and particularly on the description of political history, I intend to turn the reader's attention to deeper historical forces operating in the Jagellonian age and shaping the overall structure of society, manifesting themselves not only in political activity and religious movements, but also in the mentality and culture of each social stratum and class, especially in everyday life and in man's struggle with nature for survival.²⁵

Parallel to the debate on the Hussite movement, the plague epidemic of the late 14th century and its importance for the following social crisis was another significant subject of scholarly exchange. Jaroslav Čechura questioned older interpretations of the Hussite revolution as a consequence of the Plague of 1380, arguing that the historian should not rely on older narrative accounts but rather on empirical research at the micro scale.²⁶ Jaroslav Mezník took up Čechura's criticism in his contribution,²⁷ but rejected the assumption that the Plague could have aroused religious feelings in the population. Moreover, Mezník rejects the idea of the Hussite revolution as a 'necessary' result of the social, economic and religious development of Bohemia in the 14th century, pointing out that similar crisis phenomena, e.g., social conflicts or the decline of the Church, did not bring about similar turmoils in other European countries. Not only objective causes shaped that great historical event, Mezník maintains, but individuals' actions as well. Finally, the last phase of the debate was opened by Petr Čornej's volume "Czech History in the 14th and 15th Centuries". In his review, Martin Nodl accused Čornej of ignorance of the latest Western research on the plague epidemic of the 14th century.²⁸ It is apparent that in the case of this controversy, an older nation-oriented explanatory model competes with a differentiated one that relies on both inter-territorial comparisons and new approaches such as microhistory.

Besides these two major themes, no other broad issues have emerged within Czech medieval studies in the post-1989 period. At the same time, some leading Czech medievalists have made attempts to study successive periods of the Bohemian Middle Ages with a synthesizing intent. In connection with this, the *Lidové Noviny* edition series 'Czech History', run by Dušan Třeštík, a specialist in the history of the early Middle Ages, is worth mentioning. As the first volume of *Czech History*, Třeštík's "The Beginnings of the Přemysl dynasty" covers the development of the Bohemian Lands from the 6th to the 10th century. Indeed, Třeštík equates the early history of the Bohemian state with the history of the ruling dynasty and approaches the problem with the aim to "shatter the myths" of the nationalist historiography of the 19th and a significant part of the 20th centuries. As Třeštík himself admits, his book is "a narrative with limited objectivity," denying any "objective truth" over and above scientific discourse.²⁹

Unlike Třeštík's work, Josef Žemlička's corresponding volume on the subsequent period of the 11th and 12th centuries is a traditional outline covering various spheres of societal life in the age. Narratives describing political development and actions are followed by structural accounts of, for instance, the countryside, Christianization, administration, economy, the construction of social groups, colonization and the emergence of towns. The primary aim of the book is to provide an argument for a new interpretation of the character of the early Bohemian state. Žemlička attacks the traditional notion of "the early medieval Bohemian state as a monolith that matured as early as the 10th century and since then remained relatively unchanged in form until the end of the 12th century."³⁰

Summing up the developments in medieval history, it is striking that the stimulus of the 1960s coming from non-dogmatic Marxist and *Annales* approaches remained undeveloped after 1989. Whereas the older generation merely engaged in preserving its position from the 1960s, the younger generation of medievalists did not take up new methodological innovations and mostly adhered to traditional constitutional and administrative history as well as to parochial regional history. Synthetic accounts of 'national history' came to the fore, with a strong focus on political and dynastic history, which indeed meets with great interest on the part of the general reading public.

3. THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY-MODERN PERIOD: FROM STRUCTURAL HISTORY TO HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY?

In our view, during the 1990s, research on the early-modern age underwent the most dynamic methodological development among all the chronological divisions of Czech historical scholarship. In this respect, Czech historiography seems to have followed the general trend of Western historiography: new approaches such as new cultural history, history of sexuality, historical anthropology and gender history first took root in the historiography of early-modern history. However, as Václav Bůžek—one of the leading Czech specialists—points out, even the modernization of Czech research on early-modern history, i.e., the introduction of new methodological approaches such as the history of mentalities and everyday life, took place under conditions of a “lack of open theoretical debates, surviving mental stereotypes or strong bohemocentrism.”³¹

Despite the expansion of new research areas, the history of the political system of the Bohemian state kept its position as the crucial field of study in the history of the early-modern age. The most important forum in this field remained the review *Folia Historica Bohemiae*, in which, however, conventional administrative, constitutional and economic history predominates. Opposing this perspective, new methodological approaches to the study of absolutism and power distribution within early-modern societies, relying on Max Weber, Norbert Elias, Michel Foucault or Pierre Bourdieu, have been reflected on by the younger generation of scholars.³² Norbert Elias’ concept of ‘court society’ came to be used primarily in the study of the Prague court of Rudolf II in the second half of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries.

Closely connected with the history of the estate system in Bohemia, research on the landed aristocracy greatly expanded in the 1990s. This research could also have profited from some earlier studies, e.g., by Josef Petráň, Josef Válka or Jaroslav Pánek. This time, however, the emphasis was on culture, lifestyle and everyday life more than on the economics and the administration of dominions. According to Václav Bůžek, three main approaches appeared in Czech historiography, corresponding to the basic currents of research on aristocracy in Central Europe. The first approach focused on the study of the power struc-

ture of the Estates as well as on the absolutist state within the context of the social, economic and religious development of the Bohemian Lands, stressing the role of the aristocracy as a 'political elite.' The second approach relied on modern economic history: in studying the complex financial and accounting mechanism of aristocratic dominions, historians were able to pose broader questions, e.g., concerning bureaucratization and everyday life at aristocratic residences. The last approach, popular primarily among historians of the younger generation, was influenced by the methods of the history of mentalities and cultural anthropology: rituals accompanying birth and death, family and sexuality, childhood and old age, and so on, played an increasingly important role in research on the aristocracy.³³ In another programmatic essay, Jaroslav Pánek sketches out four tasks for the Czech study of Bohemian-Moravian aristocracy in the early-modern age. First, it should take into account the cosmopolitan character of the nobility and place it in a broader Central European or even European context. Second, it should cover the entire social spectrum of the aristocracy as well as all its social activities. Third, it should stress the religious and church activities of the aristocracy. Finally, it should emphasize the cultural development of the aristocracy in the sense of a "court culture." Obviously, both programmatic articles express a need for early-modernists to enlarge their studies both in terms of themes and geographic focus.

It is important to stress that a great deal of research on the aristocracy has been done in the framework of the so-called "regional studies". During the past ten years, one of the leading research centers concerned with the aristocracy has been the Historical Institute of the University of České Budějovice, under the leadership of Václav Bůžek. Aristocratic courts and residences have been a special focus, taking up a great deal of the edition series *Opera Historica*.³⁴ The series is marked by a shift towards a broad cultural history—or, in Bůžek's words, historical anthropology. However, as is apparent from some contributions to the volumes on everyday life and aristocratic festivities,³⁵ this shift implies new subjects of research rather than new methodological approaches or explanatory models. Thus, some contributions to the series are but descriptions of everyday life (weddings, table festivities or funerals), without locating these phenomena in broader social and political contexts. Only a minority of these studies tries to emphasize

the social meaning of everyday activities.³⁶ Be this as it may, 'historical anthropology' has become a widely employed complex approach in the field of early-modern history. Nevertheless, there has been no substantial debate about its theoretical and methodological assumptions. For instance, the contributions in the workshop of young Czech and Austrian scholars working on early-modern history dealt with 'historical anthropology' only through the chosen subjects (illness, death, funerals, purgatory, suicide etc.) rather than from a common perspective.³⁷ The popularity of historical anthropology has been reinforced by the edition of foreign works, above all those of the *Annales* school such as Le Roy Ladurie's *Carnival in Romans* or Philippe Aries' *History of Death*.

The most imposing study produced by Czech research on the aristocracy is Petr Maťa's "The World of Bohemian Aristocracy", which enriches the field with a number of fresh insights.³⁸ Maťa's volume deals with the social dynamic within the Bohemian aristocracy from the long-term perspective of two centuries, heavily relying on the latest approaches in social and cultural history. Maťa has a traditional social-historical point of departure: to "examine the social dynamic of the highest levels of Bohemian aristocratic society, its symptoms and mechanisms." Yet he rejects the hitherto dominant interpretations (going back to the 19th century) that reduced social change to shifts in property distribution. Instead, he turns his attention to social action and 'nonmaterial' factors, adopting Pierre Bourdieu's theory of action for this purpose. With the help of this conceptual apparatus, Maťa questions the notion of aristocracy as a homogenous social group or even as a class the members of which would obey common 'interests,' in order to elaborate the notion of aristocracy as a "field" full of internal conflicts. In four major sections, he analyzes titular hierarchy, economic capital, the structure of the aristocratic career and social networking, each of which was symbolically transmitted in prestige codes. Maťa maintains that only successful accumulation of capital in all of these fields made social advancement within aristocracy possible.

A remarkable shift in perspective has taken place in the social history of the peasantry and other dominated or marginalized classes. This sub-discipline could take up previous Marxist research concerned primarily with the 'class struggle' of peasants and with the so-called crisis of feudal society in the 17th century, which Czech historiography had focused

on as early as the 1970s.³⁹ A broadening of perspective to encompass “the real living and working conditions of peasants in particular historical moments” is desirable.⁴⁰ Such a perspective is advocated by Jaroslav Čechura, one of the leading specialists in the field. Only on such a background is it possible to explain overall socio-economic development of the entire society. In other words, a transition is needed from large-scale structural explanation to subtler micro-historical analysis. Similarly, Čechura shows the necessity of overcoming the older functionalist or vulgar-Marxist “economic preconditions-social effects” explanatory model in favor of finer anthropological approaches as well as comparisons between diverse regions.⁴¹ The example he uses to illustrate this is the latest research on peasants’ revolts in German-speaking countries.

Hence, one can speak of a slight shift from the older structural approaches, whether vulgar-Marxist or sociologically functionalist, towards a differentiated perspective emphasizing the living world and actions of historical individuals and social groups. Jaroslav Čechura, again, makes use of the concept of microhistory in his “Broumov Rebellion”, which is concerned with a local peasants’ revolt in one dominion in late 17th century Bohemia,⁴² as well as in his synthetic account of the wave of revolts in the Baroque age.⁴³ However, Čechura’s attitude to microhistory seems to be a troubled one. It is true that he does not reduce microhistory to a mere change of the historian’s optic from telescope to microscope; he also points out the distinctive logic of microhistorical research. At the same time, he interprets microhistory’s methodology in a rather one-sided manner and thus throws out the baby with the bath-water. According to Čechura, “microhistory’s approach brings a different logic of research. According to this, the actors are, above all, living persons acting with completely subjective understandings of certain conditions. They are acting subjects, who deal not only with decisiveness and courage, but also with cowardice, compromise and resignation.” This is, in our view, a kind of psychologization that is completely different from any kind of microhistory or Geertzian “thick description” referred to by Čechura a few lines above. What Geertz, Ginzburg, Medick and others are aiming at is not the description of the subjective world of everyday people alone, but the culture, as a system, it represents: the folk culture present in the living world of Menocchio or the economic system of culture present in the cock fights in Bali. The question is whether or not Čechura substitutes

the one-sidedness of older structural views with another one-sidedness, laying too much emphasis on the subjectivity of historical actors. Čechura's work was criticized by Pavel Himl for the insufficient explanation of rebels' motivations as well as for his arbitrary employment of the concept of social disciplining.⁴⁴

The debate on microhistory was recently enriched by Pavel Himl's book on power and authority within one Bohemian dominion.⁴⁵ Himl primarily examines the relationship between individuals and local authorities. He questions the thesis that the subjects' behavior is determined by institutions. Instead, he demonstrates the variety of social actions, strategies and mentalities of ordinary men. Whereas power relations are seen as mere processes, the individual is constituted only in the network of these dynamic power relations. Thus, the older national-historical conception, stressing the total domination of the *Herrschaft* over its *Untertanen*, has been called into question.

The last major theme to be discussed in connection with research on the early-modern period is the renewed interest in the phenomenon of the 'Baroque.' It is important to note that before 1989 research on Baroque culture was suspect in the view of orthodox Marxist historiography, since the official position was that the entire epoch was but an 'Age of Darkness,' i.e., a period of the most dreadful decline of the Bohemian state during which 'national' sovereignty was lost and a severe re-Catholization and Germanization of 'the Czech people' began. For this reason, serious attempts to identify the place of Baroque culture in Czech history were widely attacked by the official Marxist-Leninist line, which, in turn, relied on the traditional Czech ethnocentric master narrative of the 19th century.⁴⁶ After the first wave of interest in the Baroque in the 1960s, a second wave came in the mid-1980s, with an interdisciplinary debate between cultural and art historians. Thus, research after 1989 continued the work that had been started in the previous period, despite all difficulties.

According to Zdeněk Hojda,⁴⁷ one of the leading scholars and organizers of Czech Baroque research, work on the Baroque had to come to terms with several kinds of stereotypes and prejudices dating back to the 19th century. These were, among others, enlightened rationalism, bourgeois liberalism and nationalism, the trauma of the White Mountain Battle, the myth of popular culture and, contrarily, the idealization of Baroque by some Catholic historians in the first

half of the 20th century. In the conclusion of his programmatic essay, Hojda proposes several “general rules” and subjects for the study of the Baroque: the reexamination of the previously dominant epistemological assumptions; abandoning the bohemo-centric perspective and placing the Bohemian Baroque into a broader Central European context; accentuating continuity at the expense of discontinuity; stressing the role of urban culture within Baroque cultural production; analyzing the social background of Baroque culture; taking into account the question of the opposing characteristics of openness and insularity in Baroque culture; paying attention to religiosity as the constitutive framework of Baroque thought and practice; and, finally, paying respect to the aesthetic and moral value system of the Baroque.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the program envisaged by Hojda has been followed. First of all, it is not evident that Czech Baroque studies succeeded in avoiding the danger of idealization which is present, for instance, in several works of the Catholic historian Zdeněk Kalista, an open advocate of the Baroque. These works came out in the 1990s and were uncritically echoed by the majority of scholars.⁴⁸ Most historians of the Baroque saw their primary task in justifying the place of the Baroque within Czech history and in ‘breaking down’ the traditional national myths. For instance, Ivana Čornejová in her “Jesuits in Bohemia” declares her commitment to avoid both apologies and denials in order to obtain “a realistic view of the role Jesuits played in Bohemian history.”⁴⁹ However, in the parts devoted to the ‘second life’ of the Jesuits, a certain tendency towards apology is obvious. Similarly, the author of one of the most successful historical books of the decade, Vít Vlnas, remarks in the conclusion of his biography of the very important Bohemian Baroque Saint John of Nepomuk: “I do not conceal my personal preference for Catholic historians (but not for hateful clerical journalists), not only because of their weaker position and the long tradition standing behind them, but primarily because of their actual scholarly contribution.”⁵⁰

With regard to the methodological and theoretical outlook of these studies it must be noted that both are pure historical narratives free from any interpretative goals, going quite against Hojda’s propositions. Consequently, they ignore new approaches in contemporary Western scholarship such as historical anthropology, the history of mentalities and the new history of religion. This tendency comes to light above all

in Vít Vlnas' monumental biography of Eugen of Savoy.⁵¹ For almost eight hundred pages, Vlnas articulates a conventional biographical narrative, including detailed descriptions of the Prince's battles. Thus, again, Josef Válka, a member of the 1930s generation, remains the theoretically best informed Baroque researcher, relying in his contributions on French scholars such as Michel Vovelle, Mona Ozouf and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, among others.⁵²

4. IN SEARCH FOR 'SOCIETAL HISTORY:' STUDIES ON THE LONG 19TH CENTURY

In contrast to the historiography of the early-modern period, research on the so-called 'long 19th century' (1789–1918) has been, in general, less affected by new historical trends such as the new social and cultural history. The explanation of this may be seen in the fact that before 1989 the historiography of the 19th century had been ideologically more contaminated and more strictly controlled than that of earlier chronological periods. Thus, the attempts to break out of the strait-jacket of deterministic Marxism-Leninism may have led to a profound distrust of any deeper conceptual reasoning. Therefore, no major work has appeared so far that would challenge the classical Marxist-oriented works of the 1960s and 1970s on the social and political history of the 19th century (examples are Miroslav Hroch's "Social Preconditions of National Revival" and Otto Urban's "Capitalism and Czech Society"). Both of these called into question some older nationalist assumptions on the nation-building process that endured in the Marxist-Leninist Czech historiography of the 18th and 19th centuries over the entire period after 1948. At the same time, societal history—the history of the society as a whole—remains a challenge for the coming generation of historians.

In connection with this, it is interesting to remark that historians born in the 1930s wrote the most important works on the 19th century even after 1989. In the first place, Miroslav Hroch continued developing his concept of nation-building in two major works in the 1990s. First, in his "In the National Interest" he examined the function and structure of the programs of national movements, in connection with all three phases of national movement as well as the general modernization process. For this, he adopted a broad European compara-

tive perspective including Central, West, East and North European 'small nations'. Likewise, in "On the Threshold of National Existence", Hroch focused on the Czech National Movement, while broadening his previous quantitative socio-historical perspective to include closer analyses of discourses, biographies, individual strategies and narrower contexts. In both these studies Hroch shifts his attention from the social preconditions of a successful national movement, i.e., from the question why the national movement in the end achieved mass support among the members of ethnic groups, to the reasons and motives explaining why the intelligentsia disseminated the idea of the nation. Thus, he wants to study actions 'from inside.' However, this is by no means a return to biographical narrative: Hroch continues to view these processes from the social-historical perspective by setting the actors' points of view in the context of power relations within their societies. The view of the dominated classes is always compared to that of the dominant classes.

Besides Hroch's works, Jiří Kořalka's "Czechs in the Habsburg Empire 1815–1914" is the most important Czech publication of the 1990s on 19th-century history. Kořalka was inspired above all by the so-called Bielefeld school of history. Like Hroch, he places emphasis on the formation of national identities. Unlike Hroch, he goes further to include the labor movement in his study and observes the connection between the situation of the Czech working class and its position within the growing national community.⁵³

The national question has indeed remained the key subject matter of historical writings about the long 19th century. From among the works written during the 'normalization era,' Jan Křen's "Conflict Community: Czechs and Germans 1780–1918"⁵⁴ deserves attention, since it exercised considerable influence upon the younger generation of researchers. It is a lengthy essay focusing primarily on the development of ethnic relations within the Habsburg monarchy and Germany, but above all in the Bohemian Lands. Most importantly, Křen seeks to overcome the tradition of construing the Czech–Germans relation only in terms of relations between Czechs and Bohemian Germans. He puts both Czech and 'Bohemian German' political and intellectual development into a broader context of Austrian and German history.

Closely associated with the problem of the national movement, the history of Czech political life in the period between 1861 and 1918

maintained its attractiveness throughout the 1990s. (However one still had to come to terms with Otto Urban's pioneering works.⁵⁵) Besides Kořalka's book, which used some of the assumptions proposed by Urban and Hroch, Jiří Malíř's "From Associations to Modern Political Parties" should also be mentioned. This work focused on the transformation of Czech civic associations in Moravia into mass political parties in the course of the second half of the 19th century. Among various methodological approaches, he relied on political sociology and comparative party system studies as represented by Max Weber, Maurice Duverger, Rainer M. Lepsius or Stein Rokkan.⁵⁶ The problem of modern political party system formation has been intensively studied by historians of the younger generation as well. Among them are Luboš Velek and Martin Kučera, who primarily concentrated on the Young Czech Party from the 1880s to WWI. Like Malíř, Velek particularly seeks to identify the social and ideological preconditions of the making of the Czech party system in his studies, relying on sociological concepts of party research.

In line with new trends in nationalism studies,⁵⁷ a certain shift can be noted in Czech historiography from social history to 'softer,' culturalist approaches. Neither the social structure of national societies and their inner cleavages, nor institutions such as the education system and market economy, but rather representations, memory cultures, feasts, rituals and, above all, language came into focus. Jiří Rak's "Czech National Myths and Stereotypes" does not go beyond the description of the structure of historical representations in Czech national culture.⁵⁸ By contrast, the historian of philosophy Miloš Havelka and the social historian Jiří Štaif set the discourses and ideological processes of Czech nationalism in a wider societal context, using current methodological concepts in their analysis. Havelka turns to the debates on "the meaning of Czech history" from the late 19th and early 20th centuries and seeks for "symbolic centers" of Czech political culture and historical memory.⁵⁹ While in his "Historians and Society" Jiří Štaif sketches out, in a *longue durée* perspective, the interaction between political development and historical scholarship, centering around individual historians rather than discourses and institutions, in other, smaller studies he applies Pierre Nora's notion of "collective memory" to the end of understanding the function of historical symbols and rituals in cementing the unity of the Czech national community.⁶⁰

In contrast, Jaroslav Marek's synthesis entitled "Modern Czech Culture" is indebted to a more traditional understanding of 'culture.'⁶¹ Marek, "the best informed Czech historian of the *nouvelle histoire*,"⁶² tries to outline the connections and parallels "enabling us to grasp modern Czech culture as a whole."⁶³ He openly admits to have left aside the problems of material and popular culture as well as of everyday life and to have confined himself to the narrow understanding of culture, i.e., as elite cultural production. In fact, he goes even further by saying that he aims at producing "an outline of the role of culture in the formation of modern Czech society. In this, the role of material or scientific culture is considerably smaller than that of branches creating realities of an intellectual nature."⁶⁴ As one can see, this is a merely traditional point of view, which emphasizes the dominant position of elite culture, leaving only a subordinated position for popular culture and material life. This is a point of view criticized by almost all versions of *nouvelle histoire*, be it of *Annales* or of Marxist inspiration. Although Marek leaves some room for the social context of culture, such as educational institutions, his book remains more of a traditional account belonging to the history of ideas. For instance, his unreflective application of terms like 'ideas,' 'thought,' 'mentality' and even 'ideology,'⁶⁵ mostly isolated from their social context, makes his book a truly 'idealist' historical narrative.

Unlike Marek, the literary historian Vladimír Macura (1955–1999) entered the field of modern Czech cultural history with fresh approaches coming mainly from contemporary semiotic studies. In the revised edition of his "Sign of Birth", Macura seeks to grasp both the "morphology" of the Czech "revival" (he deliberately insists upon the term), that is to say, "the fundamental symptoms of the Czech revival cultural type" (i.e., metaphors, images, language of flowers, mythology or mystification) and the "set of concepts" intrinsic to it, i.e., a number of chosen thought units such as "fatherland," "nation," "people" or "centre." On the basis of his semiotic analysis, Macura stresses above all the specificity of the formation of modern Czech culture and its difference from other similar movements. He discerns this specificity in the "revivalist nature" of the modern Czech cultural process, being in fact a constant interpretation of the new:

Almost everything we think symptomatic of the Czech revival culture came to life not through tradition, but in a much more complex relation, in which continuity itself has been explicitly emphasized, while actually a break from the past has been accomplished.⁶⁶

Perhaps beyond the main scene of debates, the social history of the 19th century⁶⁷ has also experienced a remarkable reorientation in the 1990s. Having abandoned deterministic Marxism-Leninism, it sought to broaden its perspective from traditional and highly dogmatic labor movement history to include other strata of society such as the bourgeoisie, public servants, the intelligentsia, the aristocracy, and so on. Yet it was not easy to launch a systematic research agenda while lacking a new conceptual apparatus that would substitute the concept of class as utilized by Marxism-Leninism. One had to look abroad in search of new approaches. For instance, Jiří Pešek has reflected on German historiography on the middle classes, e.g., in relation to the problem of the translation of the German term *Bildungsbürgertum* into the conditions of Bohemia.⁶⁸ In the conclusion of his review article, Pešek significantly laments the lack of modern conceptually informed works on the Bohemian middle class. He points out, first, the necessity to go beyond the study of the social composition of the middle class and to focus on its cultural activities as a source of class distinction. Second, he stresses the need to include the history of the German middle class in the history of the Bohemian middle class. In a similar way, Jiří Malíř holds the study of the German urban population of Bohemia to be one of the largest ‘blank spaces’ in the research on the Bohemian middle classes in the age of Francis Joseph I.⁶⁹

Notwithstanding these pleas for the broadening of research areas, only isolated works appeared on the social history of the middle classes, such as Pavla Vošahliková’s work on civil servants in the second half of the 19th century.⁷⁰ In his own study “From Agglomeration to Metropolis”, Jiří Pešek turned to urban or communal history rather than to the social history of the middle classes.⁷¹ This book not only sheds new light on the genesis of ‘Greater Prague,’ but also compares this development with similar processes in Central and Western Europe. For this reason, Pešek’s work belongs to the few that broke down the barriers of national history.

At the same time, working class and labor movement history, heavily discredited before 1989, is lamentably lacking in Czech historical research in the 1990s. Significantly, no single article on the history of the working class or the labor movement has been published in the three most influential Czech historical journals. New Western approaches to social and protest movements have scarcely been influential. The history of the aristocracy, admittedly, has met with some interest among historians, but it remains a question whether one can really speak of social history in this case. However, it can generally be noted that new concepts and theories have hardly been discussed, even after breaking out of the straitjacket of Marxism-Leninism. Contemporary trends in the social history of the 19th century, whether German (the so-called Bielefeld school of Hans Ulrich Wehler and Jürgen Kocka and their disciples), French (the cultural analysis of Pierre Bourdieu) or Anglo-American (Post-Marxism, discourse analysis or gender history), have scarcely been influential in Czech social history. In her article symptomatically called "Can We Write a History of Society of the Bohemian Lands in the 19th Century?," the social and demographic historian Pavla Horská maintains that the Czech studies of the social history of the 19th century have yielded few results considering the volume of empirical research undertaken.⁷² There is, according to Horská, a completely false assumption that all important questions in this field have already been answered with the help of statistical analysis. Using the example of 19th-century entrepreneurs, she pleads for a close analysis of diverse social strata and milieus in order to gain insight into the actors' perspectives. In her view, new kinds of sources have to be drawn upon such as memoirs, correspondence, diaries as well as archival sources including church and juridical papers. But even Horská limited herself to the suggestion that historians should "look abroad for concepts in the social history of the 19th century," without theoretically examining these concepts and showing their advantages and limits when applied to the 19th-century society of Bohemia.

This lack of theoretical reflection also applies to the various genres and branches of the history of everyday life that would challenge the paradigm of quantitative social history. Pavla Vošahlíková in her "History of Everyday Life in the Age of Francis Joseph I" examines the impact of modernization upon the perception and experience of people mainly from the perspective of the construction of the public and private spheres

of life.⁷³ Significantly, in a review of the book in *Český Časopis Historický* (Czech Historical Review) Vošahlíková is praised, in a naive manner, for having “balanced” the “subjective sources” such as memoirs by “less biased official reports and findings.” So, the reviewer’s only criticism of Vošahlíková’s book consists in pointing out the allegedly insufficient attention paid to the role of beerhouses in Czech everyday life...⁷⁴

As a completely new branch, feminist and gender history has faced similar difficulties. Suffice it to say that only a few works regarding the Western debates in this field have been published. For the most part, the mainstream Anglo-American debate on gender and feminist history, whether of Marxist, Lacanian or deconstructionist orientation, has been widely ignored. At present, there is not enough clarity in the basic concepts in this field of research. For instance, Milena Lenderová’s “History of Women in 19th-Century Bohemia” confounds gender history with conventional women’s history and offers but a highly descriptive account of women’s everyday life.⁷⁵ Pavla Horská’s account of the origins of feminism is based on a more reflective approach, but remains confined to a peculiarly French tradition of feminism,⁷⁶ whereas Marie Neudorflová’s “Czech Women in the 19th Century” combines naive ‘women’s progress’ history with crude Czech nationalism.⁷⁷ Only two recent authors paid attention to developments in the West, especially in the United States. First, Alena Šimůnková’s examination of the marriage strategies within the Czech bourgeoisie in the second half of the 19th century goes far beyond a mere description of women’s life. Instead, she focuses on particular forms of social behavior such as marriage strategies and specific rituals such as dancing parties as intrinsic components of the constitution of the Czech patriotic middle class. Thus, she looks at aspects of gender, class and national identity in their interaction.⁷⁸ Second, Jitka Malečková, in her “Fertile Soil”, begins with an examination of the Turkish development of gender relations within the national movement and compares it with the Czech situation.⁷⁹ The book is not only one of the conceptually most successful works in the field of gender history, but also a unique attempt to compare a Central European national movement and a corresponding process in the Ottoman Empire.

Last, but not least, although military history remained largely concentrated on classical diplomatic and military histories, tendencies towards social history are also obvious. The most important attempt at broadening its perspective is Ivan Šedivý’s “Czechs, Bohemian Lands

and the Great War”.⁸⁰ While the first half of the book consists more of traditional military-historical description, the second part is devoted to the societal dimension of the war: the development of domestic policy, the role of intellectuals, economic development and everyday life, including food supplies, social care, hunger, criminality or prostitution. In the preface to his book, Šedivý comes to terms with the dominant view of WWI in Czech historical scholarship and memory, i.e., the struggle of the Czech nation for freedom. The author puts the phenomenon into a wider European context rather than remaining within a parochial perspective. This shift of perspective brings about a certain methodological modification. As Šedivý puts it,

[...] it was something of a Czech messianism that had suggested the idea of the exceptionality of Czech history between 1914 and 1918. Therefore, I tried to focus primarily on the question of the everyday rhythm of society's life rather than on traditional reflections on the mythical notions of the death of the black-yellow dragon on the one hand or on the monarchy as the model for an eventual solution of contemporary problems on the other. My attempt at conceiving it as a history of Czech society during the War and not as a history of the Czech progress to independence proved, though not entirely, to be a fruitful one.⁸¹

However, Šedivý refuses to undertake an overall analysis of Czech society during the war years. For instance, the problems of class structure and class struggle within this period remain untouched.

To sum up: one can hardly find any scholarly controversy in the domain of 19th century history comparable to those concerning Hussitism in medieval studies or those surrounding the Baroque among historians of the early-modern age. Obviously, the Czech historiography of the long 19th century is still waiting for its new key subjects to come.

5. BETWEEN HISTORY AND POLITICS: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE 20TH CENTURY

As in all the countries of the former Soviet bloc, in Czechoslovakia, the historiography of the 20th century, considered to be one of the ideological supporters of the dictatorship, was most heavily exposed to the ide-

ological control of the Communist Party. As a self-standing branch of historiography, contemporary history came into being only after 1989. However, as early as in the reformist 1960s, the 'thaw' became manifest also in contemporary history, e.g., in the case of the Committee for the History of the National Liberation Fight, which should have concentrated on the Nazi occupation of 1939–1945. However, it goes without saying that the Committee, given the political and ideological constraints, could not sufficiently reflect upon methodological and theoretical questions of contemporary history. Nevertheless, during the 1960s, several important books were published about the First Czechoslovak Republic, the Slovak National Uprising in 1944 and the Czechoslovak emigration during World War II. Some of these works as well as discussions of the relationship between historiography and politics were later condemned as 'revisionist,' and the Historical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences was even labeled as one of the centers of the 'counter-revolution' of 1968.

In the 1970s and 1980s, three branches of Czech and Slovak historiography dealt with contemporary history: the official Communist, the independent dissident, and the exile historiography.⁸² The most important for the developments after 1989 was the exile historiography that consisted mainly in works of former reformist Communist historians and intellectuals. They published several books on Communist Czechoslovakia based on their personal experience and their own collections of sources gathered in the 1960s. These authors were in many ways instrumental in analyzing the roots and the history of the Communist dictatorship and promoting the Czechoslovak opposition movement in the West. The dissident historians had no access to archival sources and their contributions usually did not go beyond 1945. After the fall of the Communist rule research on the period after 1945 received generous financial support, embodied by the brand new Institute within the Academy of Sciences.

In comparison with other branches of historiography, basic empirical research (with a strong focus on editions of sources) made progress, in order to remove the 'blank spaces' from the map of latest history. In the area of contemporary history, there were hardly any debates on theoretical issues. At the same time, among the historical periods, the 20th century is by far the most debated by the public; issues range from the character of the First Republic and the trans-

fer of the Sudeten-German population after the World War II to the problem of how to deal with the Communist past. These politicized debates draw attention to important questions concerning historical meta-narratives, the nature of historical representation, and the plurality of historiographical concepts. Such questions are usually posed by non-historians taking part in the debates. Moreover, only rarely are experts of contemporary history involved in these discussions; they often let their colleagues working on earlier periods represent the 'professional standpoint.' However, what is most significant in the case of all fields of research on 20th century history is the extraordinary role of the political standpoints of historians—with regard to the structuring of themes, the posing of questions, the use of concepts. Here, the identity of the historian seems to be involved in controversies to a greater degree than in the historiography of earlier periods. *Topoi* such as 'Munich,' 'Transfer,' 'February 1948,' the 'Prague Spring,' or the 'Velvet Revolution' time and again reappear in the political struggle of the contemporary Czech Republic.

6. THE INTER-WAR PERIOD: THE STRUGGLE FOR THE 'FIRST REPUBLIC'

Official historiography before 1989 had a hyper-critical view of the inter-war Czechoslovak Republic, usually condemning it as a bourgeois, or, at best, a bourgeois-democratic state that represented the interests of great capital against the working people. In contrast, the memory of 'Masaryk's republic' was an integral part of the 'alternative' value system present in the everyday life of society throughout the entire Communist period. Nowadays, it still plays an important role in the intellectual debate about both state and national identity. The establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 and the belief in its democratic character represent the cornerstone of the Czech discourse on statehood and democracy. However, interpretations usually differ in other aspects such as the minority question and the conception of the 'Czechoslovak nation,' foreign policy and the formation of the political system.

Like most of contemporary history writing, research on the inter-war period has been overly determined by the individual positions and identities of historians. On the one hand, the 'traditionalists' tend to

defend inter-war Czechoslovakia against the idea of Czechoslovakia as a *Fehlkonstruktion* of the Versailles system and point to Nazi Germany as the exclusive cause of its breakdown. On the other hand, historians with a more critical view emphasize the internal shortcomings of the Republic and take into account the moderate German and Slovak criticism relating to the nationality question.

However, the relatively high number of institutions specialized in the history of the inter-war period did not bring about a desirable plurality of historical writings. Recent research still primarily concentrates on political and economic history and almost totally ignores the complex areas of social and cultural history.⁸³ The predominance of political history is epitomized by the grand editions of sources covering the political programs of the inter-war political parties and the foreign policy of the Czechoslovak Republic.⁸⁴

The foreign policy of the First Republic enjoyed much of the attention of those historians who wrote mostly conventional narratives on diplomatic affairs without any conceptual framework or broader contextualization. Perhaps the most representative of this approach is Jindřich Dejmek's detailed study of Kamil Krofta, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the 1930s.⁸⁵ The author describes the last three years of Czechoslovak foreign policy before the Munich Agreement, stressing the democratic character of Czechoslovakia, its endeavor to sustain what was left of the Versailles system, and its dedicated opposition to the fascist and authoritarian threat in Central Europe. More critical towards the official foreign policy, the popularizing work of Antonín Klimek and Eduard Kubů describes foreign policy during the entire period of the First Czechoslovak Republic.⁸⁶

Even though the political history of the First Republic attracts much attention, research on its inner political development remains rather unsystematic. From among the studies in this field, it was "The Struggle for the 'Castle'" by Antonín Klimek that received the most significant response.⁸⁷ On the basis of detailed knowledge of sources, Klimek reconstructs the situation within and around the 'Castle group,' i.e., the power bloc centered round the President, dilating with delight upon the characters of the leading political figures, their personal ties and relationships. The book was widely acclaimed, though it was often criticized for remaining at the surface of personal and clique conflicts and for ignoring the social and intellectual background. As is often the case with similar

studies in political history, Klimek's book did not take into account the broader social and cultural context that shaped political actions.

Not surprisingly, the concept of political culture, heavily relied upon in Western political history, found little resonance in Czech research on inner politics. An exception is "Political Culture of German Activist Parties in Czechoslovakia 1918–1938" by Eva Broklová.⁸⁸ Combining historical analyses with democratic theory, Broklová argues that the cause of the breakdown of Czech–German relations in the first Czechoslovak Republic was not the clash of two nationalisms but rather the conflict of democratic and non-democratic principles. According to Broklová, the Czech side of the relationship tended towards democratic principles and the German side more towards non-democratic principles. Even 'activist' parties supporting the Czechoslovak state on the German side tended towards non-democratic principles. Contrary to current views that consider political culture to be a communicative system of meanings and symbols,⁸⁹ Broklová reduces the concept of political culture to the relation of political actors to democracy and thus reproduces the traditional Czech national master narrative sharply contrasting 'Czech democracy' and 'German authoritarianism.'

Recently, Broklová defended the controversial concept of the 'Czechoslovak nation' as a predominantly political rather than ethnic category, emphasizing again the supposedly deeply democratic nature of Czech political thought.⁹⁰ Her article was a reaction to Jaroslav Kučera's critical scrutiny of the term 'Czechoslovak nation' and its usage in practical political discourse in the inter-war period. Kučera expounded his views on the whole question of language politics in the First Republic and its influence upon the Czech–German relationship in his monograph *Minderheit im Nationalstaat*.⁹¹

In line with the prevailing concentration on narrative history, biographies of leading political personalities have enjoyed much attention in the historiography of the 20th century. Here, different aspects of the activities of Masaryk and Beneš have dominated the field. Nevertheless, while a political biography of Beneš has already appeared, a comprehensive account of Masaryk's presidency is yet to be written.⁹² Other major figures have appeared at least in some longer studies.⁹³ In these biographical studies, the political positions of the authors influenced their historical work. As an example one might mention the discussion of the fascist politician Radola Gajda. Whereas the biography by

Antonín Klimek and Petr Hofmann contains apologetic features and partly defends Gajda against the 'Castle,' a later biography by Miloslav Moulis fully accepts the 'Castle' views and treats Gajda, especially in his fascist period, very critically.⁹⁴

Other branches of research have largely been overshadowed by the overall preponderance of political history. The only exception has been economic history. In the course of the past fifteen years, many studies of special problems have been published.⁹⁵ The studies of German economic policies in Central and Southeast Europe are especially worth mentioning,⁹⁶ since they go beyond the narrow perspective of the nation-state. This also applies to an edited volume that, based on international comparisons, seeks to come to terms with the 'myth of the economic maturity of Czechoslovakia in the inter-war period.'⁹⁷ Obviously, economic historians managed to use theoretical concepts in their studies and were also able to look beyond the Czech-centered paradigm, as in the case of the collective project "Economic Nationalism in the Bohemian Lands," realized in cooperation with German researchers.⁹⁸

In contrast to economic history, since 1989, little has been done in the field of the social history of the first half of the century. Similarly to 19th-century social history, for a large part of the period in question, the historiography of the labor movement ceased to exist. Only recently has this begun to change.⁹⁹

If the conventional economic and social history of the period is largely marginalized, then it goes without saying that the new approaches such as 'new cultural history' or the history of everyday life almost completely fall out of the focus of research. Among the few studies published, a book by Blanka Soukupová is worth mentioning. It maps the Czech images of Germans, Austrians and Germans from the Czech Lands in the period 1933–1938.¹⁰⁰ Using a wide variety of sources, Soukupová adopts the approach of historical anthropology, a rather rare methodology in Czech historiography, especially in the writing of 20th-century history. Another attempt to apply the everyday life history approach is the book by Antonín Klimek "October 1918. Origins of Czechoslovakia", in which the author connected the 'great event' of the founding of the state with the perspective of ordinary people.¹⁰¹ All the same, it must be noted that Klimek's contribution is only a narrative account of everyday life that does not consider it as a social practice constituent of the existing social and political order.¹⁰²

Finally, the beginning of the 21st century witnessed attempts to write a synthesis of the entire inter-war period. The incentives to such an undertaking came from two major publishing houses preparing a voluminous series on the history of the Bohemian Lands. Two large volumes were published in 2000 describing the beginnings and the 'golden' decade of the First Republic between 1918 and 1929. The first one, by Antonín Klimek, leaned more towards political history and tried to carefully depict the intertwining of the inner political development of the Republic with the broader European context.¹⁰³ The second synthesis, by Zdeněk Kárník, laid more emphasis on social, economic and cultural history.¹⁰⁴ The author made an effort to profit from the results of up-to-date research in various historical disciplines including historical demography, the history of science and art history. This partly balanced the major emphasis on the explanation of structural social-economic changes. With some reservations concerning its scope, Kárník's work is widely considered to be the best synthesis available on the period.

To sum up, recent Czech historiography of the inter-war period has showed continuities with pre-1989 research, especially with regard to its thematic scope and methodology. Moreover, research remains largely restricted to 'national history,' that is, to Czech history, without serious concern for Slovak affairs. The most striking result of this is the persistence of the traditional ethnocentric view of society in the Bohemian Lands, viewing Czechoslovak Germans solely from the Czech perspective, without an effort to provide a more balanced picture and to analyze the German community from within. Another obvious deficiency is the absence of comparative ventures; 'contextualization' is confined to the study of 'mutual relations.'

7. WORLD WAR II AND THE HOLOCAUST

Czech and Czechoslovak historical writings on World War II have been dominated by political history, focusing primarily on the resistance movement and the exile fight for the renewal of the independent state. Only recently has the interest of Czech historians started to shift towards the inner political, cultural and economic development of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.¹⁰⁵ More importantly, Holocaust studies, not fitting into the Czech master narrative about the WWII, have only been on the margin of the interest of Czech historiography.

One of the most debated issues has been the history of the so-called Second Republic, which existed during the six months between the Munich Agreement in September 1938 and the occupation of the country in March 1939. The book that is worth mentioning above all is by Jan Gebhart and Jan Kuklík, dealing with the crisis of Czech politics after the Munich Agreement and the transformation of the political system along authoritarian lines.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the authors did not venture to place the short but telling history of the Second Republic into the broader context of the European development towards authoritarianism or of the contemporary debates aiming at reformulations of democracy, statehood and national identity. A different approach was taken by Jan Rataj, who describes the subtle ideological development and political struggle in the Czech politics of this period in the style of intellectual history.¹⁰⁷ Challenging the mainstream thesis about the exclusive role of external factors in the 'surprisingly easy' fall of parliamentary democracy after Munich, he tries to show the deeper roots of anti-democratic and authoritarian traditions within Czech political culture itself. At the same time, the narrow chronological scope of the book did not allow the author to formulate more general conclusions regarding the development and character of the Czech political thought of the time.

Connected with the concern with the Second Republic, Czech fascism attracted a great deal of interest on the part of historians. The most exhaustive account of the issue is to be found in the writings of Tomáš Pasák.¹⁰⁸ Unfortunately, his thorough portrayals of various streams, groups and individuals engaged in the fascist movement and/or in collaboration with the Protectorate are not framed by any broader reflections on the nature of fascism. The author does not take into consideration the international discussion of the social, cultural and intellectual origins of European fascism and does not depict the background on which the development of the Czech fascist movement might be elucidated. Therefore, proceeding in a strictly descriptive manner, Pasák arrives at conclusions derived almost exclusively from moral judgments.¹⁰⁹

Just as in the studies of other periods of modern Czech history, in the case of World War II, attempts were made to apply the perspective of the *Alltagsgeschichte* of the last decade. On the local level, it was above all Blažena Gracová who studied the impact of 'great events' on

the life of everyday persons, whereas Jan Gebhart and Jan Kuklik presented a more general view in their popularizing book "Dramatic and Ordinary Days of the Protectorate".¹¹⁰ However, in both cases, the everyday life approach is reduced to a mere description of ordinary persons' daily life, focusing on eye-catching themes such as fashion, sports, entertainment etc. Recent developments in social and micro-history that make it possible to analyze the social order from within while connecting it with a political grand narrative are scarcely reflected.

Generally speaking, there were few efforts to come up with synthetic accounts of the period of World War II, which is especially striking in the case of the highly-studied resistance movement. Further, there is an absence of analyses of the political, economic, and administrative incorporation of Sudeten-German regions into the Third Reich.¹¹¹ Finally, we still lack a serious study of the complicated power relations in the Protectorate inspired by social history and discourse analysis. Only few publications on economic history have appeared and almost none about the social history of the Protectorate, let alone the crucial question of structural continuities and discontinuities between the Nazi and the Communist dictatorships.

As was noted above, Holocaust studies occupies a special position within Czech research on World War II. Even though the Holocaust had not belonged to the 'forbidden' issues before 1989, Holocaust studies comparable with international research emerged only after the fall of the Communist dictatorship. Of course, to a certain extent, this was due to Communist Czechoslovakia's politically quite ambiguous stance towards the state of Israel before 1989. But the lack of development on the issue of the Holocaust can also be chalked up to the ethnocentric nature of the discourse of national history, which excluded the Shoah from the official historical narrative of World War II. Just as in East Germany, official historiography in Czechoslovakia focused on national and Communist resistance, with the Communists being represented as the only real victims of fascism. Since the 'national resistance of the German people against fascism' portrayed the victimization of all the people, but especially the Communists, as the basis for the legitimization of the GDR, no other victims could be admitted by this narrative. In Czechoslovakia, World War II was represented as a war of the Germans against the Czechs (Slavs), in which there was no place for other particular groups, let alone the Jews, who primarily tended to

partake of German language and culture. We have to bear this in mind in order to see the difficulties Holocaust studies faced both before and, under modified conditions, after 1989.

As for the institutional framework of Holocaust studies, four institutions do Holocaust research in the Czech Republic. First, the Terezín (Theresienstadt) Memorial concentrates more on museological than on research activities. The historians of the Memorial produce detailed studies of Terezín and publish the compendium *Terezínské studie* (Terezín Studies). The second institution, the Institute of the Terezín Initiative, is closely connected with the most distinguished Czech historian of the Holocaust, Miroslav Kárný. The institute publishes the year-book *Terezínské studie a dokumenty* (Terezín Studies and Documents) in Czech and German version and the *Terezínská pamětní kniha* (Terezín Memorial Books), which gives chronological lists of the transportation of Protectorate Jews from October 1941 to March 1945.¹¹² Two institutions of Jewish studies go beyond research on the Holocaust, studying all of the modern history of Jews in Bohemia: the Jewish Museum in Prague and the Jewish Studies Department at the Institute of Contemporary History. The former concentrates mainly on exhibitions and educational activities and runs the special journal *Judaica Bohemica*, whereas the latter has an exclusively academic character. As is the case with other fields of research, the works published on the Holocaust are mostly short specialized articles—monographs are rare.¹¹³

Being the topic of a stormy controversy, the Holocaust of the Roma population in the Protectorate attracted at certain point a great attention from the public. Actually, research already began in the 1970s, while the major books were published only in the mid-1990s.¹¹⁴ The public debate about the Roma Holocaust came to a head after the books of Markus Pape, a German journalist living in Prague, and the American writer Paul Polansky had been published on the Roma camp in South Bohemian Lety.¹¹⁵ The main point in the controversy was the question of extent to which Czechs were active in the Roma Holocaust in the Protectorate. In reaction to the radical criticism of Pape, who went so far as speaking about the “complicity of the Czech nation in the genocide of the Roma population,” a group of historians wrote a collective statement representing the position of the discipline, contrasting ‘professional scholarship with ‘amateurism.’¹¹⁶

Significantly, their criticism concentrated on the question of sources and evidence rather than on conceptual approach. Their objections to Pape and Polansky included the lack of 'standard historical critique,' the confusion of the terms 'Czech' and 'Protectorate,' as well as the alleged groundlessness of the contention that the Lety camp itself was a place of physical extinction of Czech Roma.

To sum up, the topic of the Holocaust of the Jews and the Roma is slow to arrive at the center of research interest and memory on World War II, as Wilma Iggers recently noted.¹¹⁷ This, above all, obviously holds for history textbooks, where the Holocaust is usually given only limited space, not only for professional research. For instance, in the lauded textbook "History of the Lands of the Czech Crown", more space is devoted to ice hockey games during the Protectorate than to the genocide of the Czech Jews.¹¹⁸

8. TRANSFER OR EXPULSION?

The expulsion of the German population of Czechoslovakia and Czech-German relations in general are clearly the most debated issues in recent Czech historiography. In this case, however, it is quite difficult to detach the political dimension from the academic one. Though the discussion was initiated and carried on primarily outside professional historiography, historical scholarship could not avoid getting involved in these matters, despite the recurrent efforts of some historians to strictly distinguish between academic debate and political struggle.¹¹⁹

As for the moral and political stances that, again, determined the character of the debate, two opposing positions became apparent. The first position, shared in one way or another by the majority of Czech historians, might be called 'defending.' It tries to explain and contextualize, if not defend, the policy of the Czechoslovak government and the Czech resistance movement during the war, which led to the post-war expulsion. The transfer itself is seen as one among several in contemporary Europe, and the approval of the transfer of Germans from East and Central Europe at the Potsdam Conference is considered to be the decisive moment that gave international legitimization to this procedure.¹²⁰ All these historians condemn the 'wild expulsion,' the first phase of the transfer during which crimes against the German civilian population were committed. However, some of them even reject the notion of 'col-

lective guilt' in connection with the expulsion. The 'defenders,' however critical towards the 'excesses' of expulsion they might be, point to its origins in the previous atrocities of the Nazi regime. They also criticize the historical self-description of Sudeten-Germans as double victims, first of Czech nationalism and then of Hitlerism. As the inter-war democratic republic was destroyed with considerable help from Sudeten-Germans, they were fully responsible for their own fate.

By contrast, the 'critics of the decrees'¹²¹ are not satisfied with the mere condemnation of particular elements of the expulsion, and instead attack the project as a whole. At the extreme, Edvard Beneš is seen as not only the main 'initiator' of the expulsion but the creator of a specific 'national Socialist revolution' after 1945 that paved the way to the Communist seizure of power in 1948. The expulsion is considered a unique event based on the principle of collective guilt, a phenomenon that, ultimately, has no parallel in post-war Europe. Against the previous view, these authors argue that the inter-war Czechoslovak Republic bears a part of the responsibility for the tragic end of the hundred years' coexistence of Czechs and Germans, since it did not succeed in gaining the loyalty of its ethnic minorities.¹²²

In a very restricted way, the question of the expulsion of Sudeten-Germans was already touched upon in the second half of the 1960s, in writings of younger historians who dealt mainly with Czech history during World War II. After 1968, the issue was once more excluded from official historiography. However, a provocative article by the Slovak historian Ján Mlynárik, criticizing the Czech recollection of the expulsion, stirred up a stormy controversy in *samizdat* at the end of the 1970s.¹²³ The debate in dissent was carried on without access to archival sources, yet it formed the basic standpoints that were to characterize the controversy even after 1989. One group among the interlocutors was highly suspicious of employing moral judgments to history and rejected the transfer of today's moral criteria to past events. The other side in the debate defended the right of the historian to make moral judgments as a constitutive element of historical writing.

During the 1980s, a number of younger professional historians began to explore the new opportunity of (restricted) access to some regional archives. Their endeavor bore fruit shortly after 1989. The most important work was done by Tomáš Staněk, whose "Transfer of Germans from Czechoslovakia 1945–1947"¹²⁴ was based on archival

sources, especially from northern Moravian archives. Staněk focuses on the description of the particular phases and the organization of the transfer as well as its meaning for and repercussions in Czech society and the Czechoslovak state. However, he is less engaged with the political aspects of the problem, i.e., the origins and development of the idea of transfer in Czech politics. Following Staněk's example, a large number of regional studies dealing with particular aspects of the expulsion were published after 1989.¹²⁵

In addition to the academic debate, there was a controversial discussion about the expulsion and Czech–German relations in the public, which usually did not reflect the results of historical research.¹²⁶ Although some historians engaged in the debate in the media, popularizing recent scholarly findings, their efforts obviously had only limited effect.

Regardless of the political turbulences, empirical research on the expulsion continued to expand. Václav Kural, a leading specialist in the history of Czech–German relations, in his major book analyzed the development of the relations between the two nations in the critical period of the occupation as well as the genesis of the expulsion idea within the Czech resistance and in the exile.¹²⁷ Kural does not hide his obvious 'defending' position; however, he manages to depict the events with detachment. Differentiating precisely between various political streams in the Czech resistance movement, he substantiates his thesis that it was the home resistance and the radicalized Czech society under the Nazi rule, not the exile government, that played decisive role in the development of the expulsion idea.

At about the same time, the editorial board of the journal *Soudobé dějiny* organized a discussion forum about the Sudeten-German question, which represented the contemporary Czech debate about the problem. In the words of Tomáš Staněk, it turned out that, for one thing, "the terrain [...], as far as the crucial facts and criteria are concerned, has been demarcated; for another thing, it became apparent that the Sudeten-German problem had been highly politicized." In this situation, Staněk recommended that historians work on their particular problems and refrain from further political discussion. This is an approach that many of the Czech historians who are confident about the 'neutral' character of historical scholarship would strongly support. In a way, Staněk joined the camp of those authors who plead for a critical 'contextualization' of the Sudeten-German question and refuse the

self-flagellation involved in criticizing the Czech side only. Other historians and journalists defended their positions highlighting the need for intra-Czech critical reflection on the history of the expulsion, whether or not Sudeten-Germans engage themselves in similar self-criticism.¹²⁸

The relationship of Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic respectively to Germany significantly improved after the fall of Communism in Central Europe. Nonetheless, as the conservative German governments did not pay much attention to relations with their small Czech neighbor in those years, the voice of Sudeten-German representatives became more important, backed by the Bavarian Christian Social Union (CSU). Consequently, the ‘German threat,’ personified by some Sudeten-German politicians, became a rewarding *topos* in Czech nationalist discourse.¹²⁹ In general, however, the demands of the *Landsmannschaft* have been considered highly exaggerated even by the supporters of the dialogue with Sudeten-Germans. Especially property claims and the ‘right to the motherland’ (*Heimatrecht*), based on a collective title to recover Czech citizenship, were on the Czech side understood—in the words of Jiří Gruša, writer and Czech ambassador to Germany—as a “poetic name for a mere territorial claim.”

In such a transformed atmosphere, the emphasis of the debate shifted towards the legal aspects of the problem. Numerous articles and volumes concerning the legal dimension were published, some of them as results of research projects supported by the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the aim to clarify the relevance of the ‘Sudeten-German question’ for Czech foreign policy.¹³⁰ Although these projects usually looked at the problem from the point of view of contemporary international relations in Central Europe, they were the first research-based analyses of the history of Sudeten-German organizations after 1945 written by Czech authors.

Concomitantly, historians continued writing about the transfer and other aspects of Czech–German relations in the Bohemian Lands in the 20th century. In the meantime, the focus of research shifted towards regional forms of the expulsion and transfer as well as to developments concerning the tiny German population that was not included in the transfer and remained in Czechoslovakia.¹³¹ Further, studies focusing on the so-called ‘retributive justice’ (that is, post-war retroactive justice) and various forms of persecution of broad segments of the population must be mentioned.¹³²

Although many empirical studies have been written on the transfer and the Sudeten-German question, almost no attention has been paid to the framework of collective memory in which these writings are embedded. The only exception is a book by a Czech historian living in Germany, Eva Hahnová. "The Sudeten-German Problem: A Difficult Farewell to the Past" focuses on the collective memory of the transfer as well as on the coexistence of Sudeten-Germans and Czechs in general.¹³³ Hahnová thoroughly criticizes both the Czech and the Sudeten-German master narratives, analyzing the central plots, *topoi* and images that make them so divergent and incompatible. She does not construct an alternative narrative, but rather hints at the principles that would make a 'common interpretation of the past' feasible, and, hence, would contribute to the 'solution of the Sudeten-German problem,' which is more or less of a 'psychological character.' It is above all this double focus on both the Czech and the (Sudeten-) German sides of the discourse that makes Hahnová's book unique in the context of this discussion. Its main value lies in a different approach to history, inspired by recent trends in world historiography. These trends emphasize the plurality of methodological perspectives and the ensuing plurality of meanings in historical reconstruction. The author's only aim is to provide the discourse on the expulsion and, generally, on Czech-German historical relations with the possibility of a non-ethnocentric narrative. For Hahnová, it is not the traditional building of collective identity and the corroborating of national master narratives that should be the ethos of historical scholarship, but rather a critical elaboration of the common past working in a strictly comparative manner.

While historians continued to produce empirical works on Czech-German history, at the turn of the century, the political situation in Central Europe worsened in terms of nationalist radicalization. After Jörg Haider's party had entered the Austrian government in 2000, followed by a noticeable change of policy towards the Czech Republic, the 'Decrees of President Beneš' not only resumed center stage in Czech political discourse, but even became a symbol of the 'defense of Czech national interest.' Some Czech historians found themselves obligated to respond to the critical voices on some central themes of 20th century Czech politics, especially on the expulsion. They argued that these views are lacking in what they called 'thorough historical knowledge,' and thus vindicated hegemony over historical discourse.

As a result, a number of polemical texts appeared with a more or less explicit claim to exclude 'non-professional' voices from the discourse. For instance, a group of historians produced a booklet "intended for a broader public," in which they strove to explain "all the historical roots and circumstances" of the transfer of the German minority from Czechoslovakia.¹³⁴ Criticizing the "negativist interpretations" of modern Czech political history, they stick very closely to the ethnocentric view. They apply all kinds of Czech national historical stereotypes, including the 'victim vs. oppressor' model applied to the period until 1918 and the 'democratic state-builder vs. separatist' model to the subsequent period. In the chapter describing "the historical roots of the Sudeten-German problem in the Bohemian Lands" they tried to show how the expulsion was encoded in the historical development of Czech-German relations in Bohemia, with the Germans naturally bearing the greater part of responsibility. In the last chapter, they offer a suggestive picture of post-war German revisionist political trends and warn about contemporary activities of this type.

The most significant initiative of professional historians in this tumultuous political situation was probably the declaration of the Association of Historians of the Czech Republic entitled "Historians Against the Violation of History."¹³⁵ The statement stood up against the "historization" of politics and against "amateur interpreters of the past." It maintained that historical reconstruction is an open process, yet it rejected its "utilization" or "relativization." In the face of the "dilettantish, uncritical and willfully manipulated" explanations of Czech history, the authors offered their own version of Czech-German relationship. They admitted that the expulsion of Germans was based on the principle of collective guilt, yet they claimed that in post-war Europe this was no unique phenomenon. On the contrary, the transfer of the German population was one of the internationally recognized results of WWII and a measure to prevent ethnic conflicts in the future.

The centrality of the 'Sudeten-German' question in political discourse became clear when the state itself intervened in the debate. In order to support the 'scholarly' explanation that would combat the 'amateur interpretations' of Czech-German history, the Ministry of Culture charged a group of leading historians with the task of writing an instructive volume entitled "Understanding History: The Develop-

ment of Czech–German Relations on Our Territory in the Years 1848–1948”.¹³⁶ The book was an attempt to formulate an ‘official view’ on the matter; this is also the reason why it met with the disagreement of large parts of the press and the public. The fact that historians were asked by the government to write a kind of ‘official’ view on a controversial historical question implied the assumption that scholarship was subservient to political power—a view known from times before 1989.

In all these cases it is apparent how political attitudes, despite all commitment to writing ‘history free from any bias’, do prefigure historical accounts. It is very often the ‘defenders’ itself who, in the name of a ‘scholarly approach,’ not only disregard their own value premises, but also completely avoid conceptualization, substituting it with the descriptive narration of events.¹³⁷

This was not the case with the historian Milan Churaň. In his book, Churaň openly declares his political engagement as a ‘critic’ of the expulsion.¹³⁸ Churaň tried to follow the negotiations at the Potsdam conference step by step, especially on the question of the transfers of Germans from Central and Eastern Europe. One of the main arguments in defence of President Beneš is that the transfer as such was included in the ‘Postdam Agreement,’ and, as part of the post-war European political order, it had international legitimacy. Churaň pointed out that in reality there was no legally obligating agreement, only a series of political decisions in which consent to the transfer was granted. Churaň tries to document that it was mainly the initiative of “Czech nationalism” supported by “Soviet and local Communists” that played a crucial role in the realization of the “long-time extreme goal—namely, the creation of an ethnically homogenized Slavic state.” Hence, the Czechs and the Soviets bear the main burden of responsibility for the expulsion of the Sudeten-Germans. Churaň did not attempt to describe the broader political, social, economic, and intellectual context of the historical situation. Instead, like many other ‘critics’ of the Decrees, he provides the reader primarily with moral judgments based on his political worldview and individual historical memory.

Obviously, the Czech debate on the Sudeten-German issue is in a precarious situation. Both ‘critics’ and ‘defenders’ of the expulsion hold to their positions and do not listen to the arguments of their opponents. Notwithstanding the political and moral positions of the authors, the debate on the transfer shows how deeply current Czech thought

on modern history is imprisoned in the national-historical perspective. As most of the historians understood their studies as backing a certain political position, it seems that personal identities, more than scholarly differences, are still in the foreground of the academic debate.

A first step on the way towards the 'denationalization' of the debate is the aforementioned book by Eva Hahnová, in which the development and the structural similarities of Czech and Sudeten-German historical memories are analyzed. This is not to say that research on history should be totally replaced by research on historical memory. The complex relationship between the memory and the history of the recent past is characterized by rivalry on the one hand and by mutual enrichment on the other hand. Nonetheless, the underpinning tendency of historical scholarship is (or should be) to move towards a more critical discourse. That is to say, the predominance of moral categories should be replaced by a competition among opposing though interactive analytical models and interpretations.

Based on this fundamental assumption, it is desirable to place the transfer of the Germans from Czechoslovakia into the broader context of the change of societal order throughout the whole of the late modern period, determined by the conflict between increasing state power, rapidly developing societies and the durability of traditional identities. This is scarcely possible without comparative studies on the expulsion.

Finally, indigenous sources for the expulsion should be taken into account. It seems insufficient to explain the expulsion exclusively as an immediate psychological reaction (as a 'revenge' for the years of suffering under Nazi rule), without casting the centrality of Nazi crimes into any doubt. Instead, the deeper levels of political and cultural discourse should also be reckoned with, including friend-enemy discourses or the specific concepts of social order, such as 'ethnic purity,' that in one way or another underpinned both individual and collective action.

9. THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP

When approaching the main trends in the research on the Communist dictatorship in Czechoslovakia, we should notice that it is political history that has dominated the field after 1989. Three historical junctions of this period have been concentrated upon: the Communist seizure of power in 1948 and the establishment of the dictatorship; the reformist

era of the 1960s and the Prague Spring; finally, the fall of the dictatorship in 1989.¹³⁹ To foreshadow our conclusions, it is to be noticed that the dominant paradigm was the one-dimensional approach indebted to a simplified theory of totalitarianism, stressing coercion at the cost of consent as the foundation of dictatorial regimes. This orientation brought about a narrowing of themes and questions.

The totalitarian paradigm proved extraordinarily powerful above all in the research on the establishment of the dictatorship, which started immediately after the very event, in exile. It was initiated by democratic politicians and intellectuals who had escaped to the West. In the 1960s, Communist historians in Czechoslovakia, especially those working for the so-called 'rehabilitation committees,' were allowed to make extensive use of archival materials. Some of them left the country after the Warsaw Pact forces invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968. One of them, Karel Kaplan, took thousands of copied documents with him, which he used as sources for many of his books and articles primarily concerning the 'founding' period of the dictatorship in 1948–1953.¹⁴⁰ It was also Kaplan who organized the research in this field after 1989 and who wrote the most exhaustive study on the topic.¹⁴¹

Recently, the strict concern with political history has to some extent relaxed, with studies of development in arts and culture, especially related to cultural policy in first phase of dictatorship.¹⁴² This mirrors the interest in the cultural policy of the Stalinist period in Russian and American historiography, though the Czech authors are hardly influenced by the new methodological trends in this field. With the exception of Alexej Kusák's seminal book on politics and culture in Communist Czechoslovakia, the recent studies on the history of culture follow more or less the totalitarianism-inspired approach strictly dividing 'Party' and 'culture.' In this case, the introduction of new subjects of research brought no shifts in approaches and methods.

Complementing the overall orientation of the studies on the dictatorial character of the Communist regime, research on its 'founding' period one-sidedly concentrated on persecution and repression.¹⁴³ The reasons for this go back to the 1960s, when several official historians were given access to previously secret Party documentation and published extensively on the repressive practices of the Communist state.¹⁴⁴ This was taken up again after 1990, when the opening of archives made extensive inquiries possible. Major editorial undertakings such as

the “Documents of Persecution and Resistance” appeared at this time, together with numerous articles on a wide range of forms of repression such as show trials, camps of forced labor, persecution of churches and believers, persecutions in the army and so forth.¹⁴⁵

These works mainly deal with the most violent period of 1948–1955, leaving aside less conspicuous persecution outside the ‘Stalinist’ years. However, the young historian Jaroslav Cuhra published extensively on the criminal repression of the Roman Catholic Church and the adversaries of the regime in the 1960s and after the invasion of the Warsaw Treaty armies in 1968.¹⁴⁶ Even for the period after 1956, the focus of research did not shift from repression to other stabilizing factors of the dictatorship. Among the few, a book by Muriel Blaive, a French historian living in Prague, is to be mentioned. In “The Wasted Opportunity, Czechoslovakia and the Year 1956”, the old conventional thesis that there was a higher degree of repression in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s than in other Central European countries is called into question.¹⁴⁷ In her broadly conceived analysis, Blaive argues that it was not the degree of repression, but rather a complex of several factors such as the ‘Munich syndrome’ of political leadership, anxiety about German revisionism, the legacies of Czech national identity discourse, and the economic situation that brought about the conformity of Czechoslovak society in 1956.

After its suppression, the ‘Prague Spring’ became a subject of highly controversial debates, which were, again, dominated by the political viewpoints of the participants rather than by differences in conceptual approaches. Roughly speaking, on the one hand, there were former actors and witnesses of the events of 1968, who tried to defend the notion of ‘socialism with a human face’ and the policy of the reformist Party leader Alexander Dubček. They pointed to its democratic character and later to its importance as a forerunner of Gorbachev’s *perestroika* and *glasnost*. Some even defended the notion of the ‘third way’ between capitalism and socialism. On the other hand, the ‘critics’ of reform Communism maintained that Dubček’s leadership had not aimed at a democratization of society as a whole. From this perspective, the Prague Spring was but a conflict of cliques within the Party itself, therefore it necessarily came to an end at the very moment when the monopoly of the Party and the principle of ‘democratic centralism’ were questioned.

The most representative book of the 'defenders' of the Prague Spring was the collective volume "Eight Months of the Prague Spring 1968" published in *samizdat* in 1988 and republished in 1991.¹⁴⁸ Its authors sought to defend the Prague Spring against both the official Brezhnevite interpretation of the reform as a counter-revolution supported by the imperialist West and the Czech non-Communist critique. The latter view was represented by an analysis of the political scientist and dissident Petr Pithart. According to the author, it was the failure and irresponsibility of the former reform Communists themselves that not only caused the invasion in August 1968, but also paved the way for the so-called 'normalization' regime after 1969.¹⁴⁹

At any rate, the Prague Spring turned out to be one of the central moments of restored collective memory after 1989 and as such acquired a central place in the formation of the new Czechoslovak political culture. As early as in December 1989, the Czechoslovak government established a "Special Commission for the Analysis of the Events of 1967–1970," in which former reform Communists predominated. Based on the commission's research, many studies were written, most important among which is the two-volume synthesis edited by Václav Kural and Václav Mencl.¹⁵⁰ Even though the book was based on new archival research, in its conception 'defending' Dubček's policy it was very close to the previous "Eight Months". At the same time, the authors could portray the social context of the Prague Spring in a way that hinted at the complex dynamics of historical development in 1968.

Similarly to a great deal of contemporary Czech history, the studies on 1968 have only to a small extent been accompanied by reflection on concepts and approaches. Neither the fundamental problems of the Prague Spring, nor the approaches for its study have been profoundly discussed. It is worth mentioning the debate in the journal *Soudobé dějiny* in 1993/94, encouraged by a critical article by the historian Jan Měchýř, who tried to challenge some of the 'legends' surrounding the year 1968.¹⁵¹ The subsequent debate, in which only 'witnesses' took part, centered around crucial questions of the interpretation of the Prague Spring. All the same, moral-political standpoints dominated the controversy. Whereas one side defended the reform program as unambiguously progressive 'within the limits of the feasible,' the other side considered it a mere result of a clash of factions inside the Party itself and argued that the 'reform plans,' lacking sufficient political backing, provided too lim-

ited space for a profound democratization and liberalization of society. Recently, discussions have seemed to aim at more complex questions concerning the basic features of the 'reform politics' of the Dubček leadership, though still without deeper theoretical reflection.¹⁵²

Fed on the massive moralization of the subject, the general predomination of old-fashioned 'great men' history over the analysis of broader social forces and political discourses became obvious in the highly moralized controversy about the role of Alexander Dubček. Antonín Benčík, one of the most fervent defenders of Dubček, published an apologetic book, pointing out that Dubček had been ahead of history with his concept of 'democratic socialism.'¹⁵³ In his review article, the young historian Jiří Suk pointed out the inherent conflict between the 'collective reform-Communist memory' that determined the content of Benčík's book and the 'historical erudition' that aimed at a strictly scholarly text.¹⁵⁴ Suk refused the basic criterion of 'historical greatness,' applied by Dubček's biographer, and instead pointed out the insufficiently reflected symbolic value of Dubček both in the West and the East, also calling for a precise distinction between history and memory in the study of 1968.

Unlike the Prague Spring, the so-called 'normalization'—this was the official term coined by the Husák regime—has not met with much interest among historians so far. As a kind of 'prehistory' of the democratization after 1989, the development and forms of the democratic opposition (particularly Charter 77) were studied and discussed. The most important attempt to interpret this period in terms of the relationship between the opposition and the entire society was Milan Otáhal's "Opposition, Power, and Society" first published in 1994.¹⁵⁵ It was the first and, to this day, the last attempt at a general portrayal of the period. It emphasizes its three major 'phases:' the immediate reaction to 1968, Charter 77 and the rise of the opposition movement, and the politicization of society in the Gorbachev era. The author sought to carefully differentiate between the various streams and strategies of the opposition and in the Communist Party. However, the third element in the title, namely society, remained rather fuzzy in the author's account. As is the case with the majority of accounts of the 'normalization' era, society is treated in an abstract manner and remains a kind of 'mystery,' a buffer zone between power and dissent.

It was also this book that prompted a debate on Charter 77 in historiography.¹⁵⁶ The book contains an assessment of the political philosophy of Charter 77—as represented particularly by Václav Havel—and of the way in which the historian and ‘witness,’ in one person, can approach a certain historical phenomenon. Whereas Otáhal assumed a very critical stance towards the Charter, trying to show its deficiencies and contemplating possible alternatives, the exile historian Vilém Prečan considered this approach to involve an inadmissible moralization of history as well as “iconoclasm.” Similar controversies, with an even more direct link to politics, reappeared in the public discourse of the 1990s. The discussions were usually initiated by the former dissidents themselves and perpetuated the same pattern. Whereas one side believed that Charter 77 was the ‘conscience’ of society and an important predecessor of the democratic revolution, the other side viewed the dissent more as a self-sufficient and self-proclaimed idealist elite without any real influence on the broader society.¹⁵⁷

Finally, it is clear that the discussion of the fall of the dictatorship in 1989 is also dominated by the personal views of the actors. There are plenty of personal memoirs and journalist accounts. However, only few attempts have been made at an historical analysis of the event. The first one was by Milan Otáhal in his above-mentioned book on the opposition, which also deals with ‘the beginning of the revolution.’ In Otáhal’s view, it was above all Gorbachev’s *perestroika* and only to a small degree the Czechoslovak opposition that induced the belated rise of political consciousness among the Czechoslovak population.

The most significant contribution to the history of the 1989 events in Czechoslovakia is “Through the Labyrinth of the Revolution” by Jiří Suk.¹⁵⁸ In his well-written ‘phenomenology of the revolution,’ he analyzes the preconditions of the formation of the Civic Forum, its changes during the first months, its organizational structure, and its assumption of power after the establishment of the ‘government of national understanding,’ the first Czechoslovak post-Communist government. Suk persuasively describes the strong and weak moments of the dissident intellectuals in power and shows how the determining factors of the ‘negotiated revolution’ ensued from both the immediate situation and the political imagination of the dissidents and the Communist leaders. However, staying within the bounds of his miniature canvas, Suk deliberately refrains from a more general assessment, from the long-term

perspective of Czech and Czechoslovak history and/or the transition to democracy.

Generally speaking, the historiography of the Communist dictatorship also has been dominated by political history. It heavily relies on the theory of totalitarianism, in which the power structures of the state and the Party are in sharp opposition to society. So far, problems connected to the societal context of the reproduction of power such as the creation of social consensus, the social and mental preconditions of the Communist rule (which are also related to the national question in Communist Czechoslovakia) have not received enough attention. In the case of these, the methods of discourse analysis or microhistory could be employed. Moreover, not only the new social history approaches but the traditional structural social and economic history of the Communist period as well are seriously lagging behind research on power politics. The deficiencies of contemporary Czech history become obvious especially when compared with the historiography of the GDR, where a true battle of concepts took place: the totalitarianism approach has been challenged by the employment of a rich arsenal of social historical approaches ranging from 'durchherrschte Gesellschaft' (society drenched with authority) and 'Fürsorgediktatur' (welfare dictatorship) to 'Eigen-Sinn.'¹⁵⁹ Finally, comparative works placing the developments in Communist Czechoslovakia in the broader context of dictatorships in the 20th century are missing. Nevertheless, some current projects seem to promise certain changes in research priorities.¹⁶⁰

10. CONCLUSION: IN SEARCH OF NEW PARADIGMS

At the end of the 20th century, Czech historical scholarship was marked by an internal controversy somewhat ironically called the 'Czech *Historikerstreit*.' The debate broke out at the 8th Congress of Czech historians in September 1999. It is not that before there had not been any discussions concerning the place of historiography in contemporary society, or even the 'Communist past' of historiography. However, the focus of these discussions had been limited, and the arguments had often been *ad hominem*. Only at the Congress did the debate take on a less personal and more general tone. This was preceded by an article by the head of the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences,

Jaroslav Pánek, entitled "Czech Historical Scholarship and Czech Historical Consciousness."¹⁶¹ In this general commentary on the role and social responsibility of historiography, the author expressed his concern about some recent "reinterpretations of Czech history" especially in the daily press, many of which were, according to Pánek, influenced by a "negativist" understanding of Czech history allegedly originating in the Sudeten-German interpretation. In opposition to this view, Pánek suggested that the priority of the central Czech historical institutions should be to cultivate "national historical consciousness" and a positive conception of Czech history, consolidating and solidifying national identity in a European context.

During the Congress proceedings, a group of young historians stood up in reaction to Pánek's article to formulate a sharp critique of the recent development of Czech historiography. They rejected Pánek's call for closer cooperation among Czech historians in order to form a "positive and united historical interpretation" as well as his fusing of "national interests" and "national history."¹⁶² Instead, they claimed that historians should reflect on their individual, often quite problematic, pasts, which would be the best way to benefit contemporary Czech society. Additionally, they attacked the academic institutions in which "former Communist cadres decide about the distribution of resources" even today.¹⁶³

The controversy of 1999 and afterwards epitomizes general tensions within Czech historical scholarship at the turn of the 20th century. On the one hand, mainstream historiography, housed in traditional institutions, overwhelmingly ensures the continuity of historical research, writing, and teaching in the style of traditional political history (in the case of modern history) and traditional social, economic or narrowly defined cultural history (in the case of earlier history). On the other hand, some historians, mainly young, seek to establish new critical approaches following the developments in new cultural and social history. Yet, our stress on the personal and institutional continuity of traditional forms of historiography should not be taken to imply the charge of a conscious obstruction of progress. Rather, what is at stake here is the continuity of the *habitus* of scholars as well as the mental framework and the strong patronage system that make it difficult for new approaches and subjects to emerge. Nevertheless, especially since 2000, there has been a trend towards establishing new paradigms (not

the Paradigm), a set of perspectives, approaches and methods that, albeit not in a revolutionary way, are capable of replacing the old ones.

Let us conclude by reviewing the four central themes in our account. First, Czech historical studies experienced a real thematic expansion after 1989. Yet, this was not accompanied by innovations in methodological reasoning; rather, the main driving force has been the aspiration to cover the 'blank spaces.' This approach strengthened political history at the expense of other fields. Thus, the 'liberalization' of history after 1989 brought the restoration of old themes more than the introduction of new ones—the latter have often been dismissed as mere 'vogue.' This trend has not brought any consensus to the discipline; on the contrary, it fomented new controversies.

Second, Marxism-Leninism has been thoroughly assessed by medieval and early-modern research, where the Marxist tradition was understood as a serious partner in the discussion. In contrast, in modern history, the Marxist tradition was either totally ignored or one-sidedly dismissed as mere 'ideology.' Yet, this lack of reflection on the past of the discipline made the continuity of certain explanatory models and modes of thought possible. Adapted to the new conditions after 1989, some interpretation patterns beyond the explicitly ideological proved to be unexpectedly durable. As early as in 1988, Eva Schmidt-Hartmann (later Hahnová) pointed out a certain similarity between official Marxist-Leninist and unofficial dissent historiography: both were indebted to the nation-centered narrative, the monistic and teleological notion of history, and involved an extremely polarized representation of the past.¹⁶⁴

Third, regarding new approaches and methods, especially those coming from new cultural and social history, only slow progress took place in Czech historiography. Due to the insufficient examination of the legacy of Marxism, new theoretical approaches to historical writing are often considered to represent a cloaked return of Marxism, and, thus, are 'violations of history.' The belief in value-free research and the possibility of separating 'lies' (myths) from 'the truth' (scholarly knowledge) is constitutive of most of Czech historiography. This has resulted, particularly in the case of modern history, in descriptive, event-oriented history writing, without major explanatory goals. However, as we have seen, there are unexamined theoretical assumptions (e.g., connected with the notion of totalitarianism, present in

many studies of the Communist period) under the descriptive surface of many historical accounts. It seems that the most serious hindrance to methodological innovation is the lack of autonomous research institutions that would support new methodologies, independently of the mainstream. Thus, so far, innovations have mainly come from individual scholars. Finally, the limited character of international exchange has also exercised a negative influence here.

Fourth and last, nation-centric modes of writing history are obviously deep-rooted both before and after 1989. Yet, with regard to this, it is necessary to discriminate between particular domains of research. Whereas in connection with earlier historical periods attempts have been made to look beyond national history (the discussion of the causes of the Hussite movement is a good example), in modern and contemporary history the ethnically defined nation remained the central frame of reference. The most striking example is the marginalized position of the Holocaust of Bohemian Jews within the Czech historical narrative of the 20th century. Comparative studies are also rare, and, moreover, usually take the nation as a starting-point.

NOTES

- 1 Tůma, "Czech Historiography of Contemporary History (1945–1989)" in *Historica* 9 [2002], 125–154. For the focus on the 'winners' in the history of science see Kohli, "'Von uns selbst schweigen wir.' Wissenschaftsgeschichte aus Lebensgeschichten," in Wolf Lepenies, *Geschichte der Soziologie*, 428–465.
- 2 Various approaches to the history of historiography are summarized by Simon, *Historiographie. Eine Einführung*; see also Bentley, *Modern Historiography*, and Raphael, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeitalter der Extreme*.
- 3 On institutionalization see Torstendahl and Veit-Brause (eds.), *History-Making. The Intellectual and Social Formation of a Discipline*; Lingelbach, *Klio macht Karriere*; Middell and Lingelbach (eds.), *Historische Institute im internationalen Vergleich*.
- 4 See Connelly, *Captive University*; Connelly and Güttner (eds.), *Zwischen Autonomie und Anpassung: Universitäten in den Diktaturen des 20. Jahrhunderts*.
- 5 For this argument, see Markwik, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia*.
- 6 In the place of three existing departments (Czechoslovak History, General History and Prehistory, Auxiliary Disciplines) a new institution was introduced between 1992 and 1994. The Department of Czechoslovak History

was transformed into the Institute of Czech History covering the whole chronological spectrum from the early Middle Ages to contemporary history. The Department of General History and Prehistory was transformed into the Institute of World History, with a strong focus on modern history, whereas Ancient History and Prehistory were given their independent departments within the Faculty. Finally, in 1993, a new Institute of Economic and Social History was founded, specializing primarily in the social and economic history of the Bohemian Lands and Central Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries.

- 7 The Institute consists of the departments of German, American, Western European and Eastern European studies.
- 8 In 1994, the Department of Central, South-East and East European History was incorporated into the Institute of History. The focus of research in the Institute is the state and society in Bohemia in the 14th and 15th centuries, the social and cultural history of the early-modern age, the formation of the political system in the Bohemian Lands and the Habsburg Monarchy in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, the history of the Roma in Czechoslovakia, and Moravian history through all historical periods.
- 9 For instance, in Hradec Králové, two research projects have been launched, focusing on the history of the region of Kladsko (in cooperation with Polish historians) and of Eastern Bohemia in the 19th and 20th centuries. The history department of the University of Ostrava specializes in the history of industrialization and proto-industrialization (the department participated in the proto-industrialization project of the Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen), the history of national stereotypes and prejudices in Central Europe, and the history of the Roma in the region after 1945. The Historical Institute of the University of České Budějovice concentrates on research on the nobility in the early-modern period, with a regional focus. The history department of the Technical University of Liberec focuses on the history of Lusatia in the early-modern period and the history of Germans in certain regions in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, it has to be noted that a modern social history of regions is a long way from old-fashioned, parochial regional history.
- 10 In 1994, the reorganization of the departments took place as a consequence of the incorporation of the Institute of Central and Eastern European History, abolished 1993, into the Institute of History. The former two departments were united into the Department of Ancient Czech History, while the latter two became the Department of Modern Czech History and the Department of 19th and 20th Century World History, respectively. In 1998, the new head of the Institute, Jaroslav Pánek, restored the division between medieval and early-modern Czech history.
- 11 The Civic Forum (Občanské fórum), founded in November 1989, was a non-party civic movement, composed of various opposition and activist groups, independent initiatives, and representatives of social and religious

organizations. It became the leading political body in the Czech Lands in the first phase of the transition period, during and after the fall of the Communist dictatorship (its counterpart in Slovakia was the Public Against Violence [Verejnost' proti nasiliu]).

- 12 See the chapter on contemporary history below.
- 13 Marek and Šmahel, "Škola Annales v zrcadle českého dějepisectví".
- 14 Ibid. 16.
- 15 Macek, *Ľagellonský věk v českých zemích (1471–1526)* 3 Vols.
- 16 See the paragraph below.
- 17 Petrání et al., *Dějiny hmotné kultury*, 3 vols.
- 18 Mezník, *Praha před husitskou revolucí*.
- 19 Válka, "Nové dějepisectví a české dějiny", 472.
- 20 Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 1., 9.
- 21 Kalivoda's book should be assessed in the context of the contemporary debate on 'bourgeois revolutions.'
- 22 Šmahel, *Husitské Čechy. Struktury, procesy, ideje*. 14.
- 23 In ČČH, the central review of Czech historiography, the reedition of Kalivoda's book has not been reviewed; nor in the specialized *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*.
- 24 See the chapter *Společnost, řád, stavy - základní pojmy* (Society, Order, Estates—Basic Concepts), vol. I, 172–179.
- 25 Ibid, vol. I., 9.
- 26 Čechura, "Mor, krize a husitská revoluce", 286–303.
- 27 Mezník, "Mor z roku 1380 a příčiny husitské revoluce", 702–710.
- 28 Nodl, "Předhusitské mory – k problémům jedné interpretace", 491–503.
- 29 Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců. Vstup Čechů do dějin*, 14.
- 30 Žemlička, *Čechy v době knížecí*, 7.
- 31 Bůžek, "Šlechta v raném novověku v českém dějepisectví devadesátých let", in Bůžek and Král (eds.), *Aristokratické residence a dvory v raném novověku*; see also Pánek, "Šlechta v raně novověké Evropě z pohledu českého a evropského bádání" in Bůžek (ed.), *Život na dvorech barokní šlechty (1600–1750)*, 19–45.
- 32 See Vybíral, "Stavovství a dějiny moci v českých zemích na prahu novověku" 725–759
- 33 Koldinská, *Každodennost renesančního aristokrata*.
- 34 See volumes 7 and 8 of the series Bůžek and Král (eds.), *Rezidence a dvory v raném novověku; Slavnosti a zábavy na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech raného novověku*.
- 35 Bůžek, (ed.), *Příspěvky ke každodenní kultuře novověku*.
- 36 See Mařa, "Karneval v životě a myšlení raně novověké šlechty". The work stresses the meaning of the carnival in society's architecture and popular culture early-modern Europe. See also Vorel, "Aristokratické svatby v Čechách a na Moravě v 16. Století jako prostředek společenské komunikace a stavovské diplomacie"; and Král, "Pohřební slavnosti jako prostředek a místo komunikace raně novověké společnosti".

- 37 Stefanová and Búzek (eds.), *Menschen-Handlugen-Strukturen*.
- 38 Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)*.
- 39 Two major works are Polišenský, *The Thirty Years' War*; and Hroch and Petráň, *Das 17. Jahrhundert – Krise der Feudalgesellschaft?*
- 40 Čechura, “Rolnictvo v Čechách v pozdním středověku”, 477.
- 41 Čechura, “Rolnické revolty raného novověku – přehled středoevropského bádání”.
- 42 Čechura, *Broumovská rebelie*. See also his programmatic article “Mikrohistorie – nová perspektiva dějepisectví konce tisíciletí?”.
- 43 Čechura, *Selské rebelie roku 1680*.
- 44 Himl, “Nová košťata sociálního ukáznování a mikrohistorie”.
- 45 Himl, *Die ‘armen Leüte’ und die Macht*.
- 46 See, for instance, the review of a biography of the Czech Baroque Jesuit historian Bohuslav Balbín, ‘Das Temno J.P. Kučery a J. Raka’, *Československý časopis historický* 33, 1985, 101–105.
- 47 Hojda, “‘Idola’ barokního bádání aneb jak se vyhnout Skyle a neupadnout v osidla Charybdy”, in Hojda (ed.), *Kultura baroka v Čechách a Moravě*.
- 48 See Kalista, *Tvář baroka; Století andělů a ďáblů. Jihočeský barok* (see also the critical epilogue by Vít Vlnas).
- 49 Čornejová, *Tovaryštvo Ježíšovo. Ježuité v Čechách* (The Society of Jesus. The Jesuits in Bohemia), 235.
- 50 Vlnas, *Jan Nepomuk. Česká legenda*, 262.
- 51 Vlnas, *Princ Evžen Savojský*.
- 52 Válka, “Barokní slavnosti,” in Hojda (ed.), *Kultura baroka*, 53–63 and Válka, “Homo festivans,” in: Búzek (ed.), *Slavnosti*, 5–17. Válka dealt with the Baroque as early as in the 1960s—see his lucid essay ‘Problém baroka jako kulturní a historické epochy’, in Kopecký (ed.), *O barokní kultuře*, 11–24.
- 53 Kořalka, *Češi v habsburské říši a v Evropě 1815–1914*.
- 54 Křen, *Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918*.
- 55 Besides *Capitalism and Czech Society*, Urban’s *Česká společnost 1848–1914* must also be mentioned.
- 56 Malíř, *Od spolkům k moderním politickým stranám*.
- 57 See Klimó, ‘Das Ende der Nationalismusforschung? Bemerkungen zu einigen Neuerscheinungen zu “Politische Religion,” ‘Fest’ und ‘Erinnerung’”.
- 58 Rak, *Bývalí Čechové*.
- 59 Havelka (ed.), *Spor o smysl českých dějin*; also *Smysl a dějiny*.
- 60 Štaif, “The Image of the Other in the 19th Century: Historical Scholarship in the Czech Lands,” in Wingfield (ed.), *Creating the Other. Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe*.
- 61 Marek, *Česká moderní kultura*.
- 62 According to Josef Válka in his article “Nové dějepisectví,” footnote n. 8.
- 63 Marek, *Česká moderní kultura*, 9.
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 For instance, in the chapter “Thought and Mentality,” Marek speaks of the “neutrality of the Enlightenment” (57).

- 66 Macura, *Znamení zrodu*, 6.
- 67 Štaif, "Die tschechische Historiographie zur Sozialgeschichte der böhmischen Länder (1526–1848) vor und nach dem Jahre 1989,"; Machačová and Matějček, 'Sociální historiografie období industrializace českých zemí z let 1990–2000'.
- 68 Pešek, "Německá diskuse z let 1985–1992 o tématu: Bürgertum, Bildungsbürgertum konce 18. až počátku 20. století".
- 69 Malíř, "Bürgertum in Mähren zwischen Prag und Wien". in Stekl et al., *Bürgertum in der Habsburger Monarchie*, 95. In his review of the three-volume *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, Malíř calls for the application of the concept of Bürgertum and Bürgerlichkeit in Czech historiography, "to use it for a deeper analysis of social reality in the Bohemian Lands in the 19th century as well as to compare it with the situation in the other lands of the Monarchy and Europe," Malíř, 'Review of Kocka's *Bürgertum in 19. Jahrhundert*', in *Časopis matice moravské* 109, 1990, 183.
- 70 Vošahlíková, *Vom Amts Wegen: k.k. Beamte erzählen*.
- 71 Pešek, *Od aglomerace k velkoměstu. Praha a středoevropské metropole 1850–1920*.
- 72 Horská, "Umíme napsat dějiny společnosti českých zemí 19. století?," 847–857.
- 73 Vošahlíková, *Jak se žilo za časů Františka Josefa*.
- 74 *Český časopis historický* 97, 1999, 373.
- 75 Lenderová, *K hříchu i k modlitbě: žena v 19. století*.
- 76 Horská, *Naše prababičky feministky*.
- 77 Neudorfllová, *České ženy v 19. století. Úsilí a sny, úspěchy i zklamání na cestě k emancipaci*.
- 78 Šimůnková, "Status, odpovědnost a láska: vztahy mezi mužem a ženou v české měšťanské společnosti v 19. století".
- 79 Malečkova, *Úrodná půda. Žena ve službách národa*.
- 80 Šedivý, *Češi, české země a velká válka 1914–1918*.
- 81 Ibid. 5.
- 82 See Otáhal, *Normalizace 1969–1989. Příspěvek ke stavu bádání*, 9–15.
- 83 For a detailed and commented bibliography up to 2000, see Harna, *Historiography on the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918–1938)*. In *Czech historiography in the 1990s*, 113–143.
- 84 In addition, the Masaryk Institute publishes the oeuvre of the first president, Tomáš G. Masaryk; the Society of Edvard Beneš is trying to do the same with the work of Edvard Beneš, the second president and later exile leader. See <http://www.msu.cas.cz/>; <http://mujweb.atlas.cz/spolecnost/spoleb/>.
- 85 Dejmek, *Kamil Krofta. Historik v čele diplomacie*.
- 86 Klimek and Kubů, *Československá zahraniční politika 1918–193*. Further monographs worth mentioning: Břach, *Československo a Evropa v polovině dvacátých let*; Sládek, *Malá dohoda 1919–1938. Její hospodářské, politické a vojenské komponenty*.
- 87 Klimek, *Boj o Hrad*.

-
- 88 Broklová, *Politická kultura německých aktivistických stran v Československu 1918–1938*.
- 89 On the cultural history of politics, see Mergel, “Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik”.
- 90 Broklová, “Politický nebo etnický národ?”, which was a reaction to Jaroslav Kučera, “Politický či přirozený národ?”.
- 91 Kučera, *Minderheit im Nationalstaat. Die Sprachenfrage in den tschechisch-deutschen Beziehungen 1918–1938*.
- 92 Zeman and Klimek, *The Life of Edvard Beneš, 1884–1948. Czechoslovakia in Peace and War*. The Czech, reworked version is published under the name of Zbyněk Zeman only: *Edvard Beneš. Politický životopis*. There are several biographies of Masaryk that map his political activity before 1914 and during the war. See especially: Kovtun, *Masarykův triumf*; Jaroslav Opat, *Filozof a politik T.G.Masaryk, 1882–1893*; Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk’s Realism*.
- 93 Two top-ranking personalities, Alois Rašín, the first Minister of Finance, and Antonín Švehla, the long-time chairman of the agrarian party and Prime Minister several times, have detailed biographies. The biography of the latter is not by a Czech author, but by the American historian David E. Miller. The English-language original of Švehla’s biography is Miller, *Forging Political Compromise. Antonín Švehla and the Czechoslovak Republican Party, 1918–1933*. A biography of Rašín is Šetřilová, *Alois Rašín*.
- 94 Klimek and Hofmann, *Vítěz, který prohrál: General Radola Gajda*; Moulis, *Vzestup a pád generála Gajdy*.
- 95 Among the most important books are Teichová, *Mezinárodní kapitál a Československo v letech 1918–1938*; Lacina, *Zlatá léta československého hospodářství 1918–1929*.
- 96 E.g., Kubů, *Německo—zahraničně politické dilemma Edvarda Beneše*; Jančík, *Třetí říše a rozklad Malé Dohody*.
- 97 Kubů and Pátek, *Mýtus a realita hospodářské vyspělosti Československa mezi světovými válkami*.
- 98 Kubů and Schultz (eds.) *Wirtschaftsnationalismus als Entwicklungsstrategie ostmitteleuropäischer Eliten*.
- 99 See Gawrecki, “Die Arbeiterbewegung im Industriegebiet von Mährisch-Ostrau im Spiegel der tschechoslowakischen Historiographie nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg”. Significantly enough, the lack of indigenous research led one of the publishing houses to publish in 2002 Jacques Rupnik’s work from the 1970s: Rupnik, *Dějiny Komunistické strany Československa*. As a sign of new interest in the topic, see the collective volumes Kárník and Kopeček (eds.), *Bolševismus, komunismus a radikální socialismus v Československu*, vols. I–V.
- 100 Soukupová, *Český sebevědomý sen a evropská realita*.
- 101 Klimek, *Říjen 1918. Vznik Československa*.

- 102 Lüdtke (ed.), *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experience and Ways of Life*.
- 103 Klimek, *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české*, Vol. XIII, 1918–1929.
- 104 Kárník, *České země v éře první republiky (1918–1938)*.
- 105 For a detailed bibliographical overview up to the year 2000, including a number of editions of sources, see Gebhart, “Historiography on the Period 1938–1945”. In *Czech Historiography in the 1990s*, 150–155.
- 106 Gebhart and Kuklík, *Druhá republika 1938–1939. Svár demokracie a totalita v politickém, společenském a kulturním životě*.
- 107 Rataj, *O autoritativní národní stát*.
- 108 Pasák, *Pod ochranou říše*; id, *Český fašismus 1922–1945 a kolaborace 1939–1945*.
- 109 A recent effort to depict Czech Fascism in its international context is a longer study Krejča, “Český fašismus”; Cf. also Gregorovič, *Kapitoly o českém fašismu*; Nakonečný, *Vlajka. K historii a ideologii českého nacionalismu*.
- 110 Gebhardt and Kuklík, *Dramatické a všední dny protektorátu*.
- 111 See the work of German historian Volker Zimmermann, *Die Sudetendeutschen im NS-Staat. Politik und Stimmung der Bevölkerung im Reichsgau Sudetenland*.
- 112 Kárný et al., *Terezínská pamětní kniha. Židovské oběti nacistických deportací z Čech a Moravy 1941–1945*. Note also the introductory study on the genocide of the Bohemian Jews by Miroslav Kárný, Vol. 1 19–24.
- 113 From among the few, Mečislav Borák’s book on the first deportations of Jews to the concentration camp is worth mentioning. Borák, *Transport do tmy. První deportace evropských Židů*; see also Petrův, *Právní postavení židů v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava (1939–1941)*. The student of the Holocaust can profit from a number of collective volumes resulting from several international conferences on the ghetto and concentration camp of Terezín and the Holocaust of Bohemian and Moravian Jews.
- 114 See above all Kladivová, *Konečná stanice Auschwitz-Birkenau*; Nečas, *Českoslovenští Romové v letech 1938–1945; Holocaust českých Romů*.
- 115 Pape, *A nikdo vám nebude věřit. Dokument o koncentračním táboře Lety u Písku*; Polansky, *Dvakrát tím samým. Básně o romském holocaustu; Tiživé mlčení. Svědectví těch, kteří přežili Lety*.
- 116 *Historikové a kauza Lety*.
- 117 Iggers, “Das verlorene paradies”.
- 118 *Dějiny zemí Koruny české* vol. 2., Out of the 48 pages devoted to the period 1939–1945, not more than five sentences (!) are devoted to the Holocaust of Jews.
- 119 For a detailed analysis of the whole Czech debate after 1989, see Kopeček and Kunštát, “Sudetoněmecká otázka.”
- 120 The use of terms is important, although quite confused. In Czech, basically three terms are used: ‘vyhnání – expulsion’ is more often used by

- critics and generally by Germans (Vertreibung); 'vysídlení-evacuation' is used comparatively little; 'odsun-transfer' is the most frequently applied term in the Czech discourse that has the least 'violent' connotation. However, many authors use two or all three of these terms as more or less synonyms.
- 121 Referring to the decrees signed by President Edvard Beneš that dealt with the status of Germans and Hungarians in Czechoslovakia after the World War II and legally prepared the way to the transfer.
 - 122 Hans Lemberg speaks about two contradictory legends. The first one is about the Sudeten-Germans as a fifth column of Hitler. This view tends to be adopted by the 'defenders.' The opposite legend is about Beneš as the father of the transfer idea. This tends to be adopted by Sudeten-Germans as well as the 'critics of the Decrees.' See Lemberg, "Vývoj plánů na vysídlení Němců z Československa".
 - 123 The most important contributions were published in 1990. See Češi, Němci, odsun. *Diskuze nezávislých akademiků*; Jederman, (the pseudonym of Petr Příhoda), *Ztracené dějiny*; Hübl, *Češi, Slovinci a jejich sousedé*.
 - 124 Staněk, *Odsun Němců z Československa 1945–1947*.
 - 125 See the list elaborated by Robert Luft on webpage of Collegium Carolinum: <http://www.collegium-carolinum.de/doku/lit/bibl-vertreibung.htm>
 - 126 For the historiographical production in the first years after 1989, see Kučera, "Česká historiografie a odsun Němců. Pokus o bilanci čtyř let".
 - 127 Kural, *Misto společenství konflikt! Češi a Němci ve Velkoněmecké říši a cesta k odsunu 1938–1945*.
 - 128 See "Forum: O sudetoněmecké otázce".
 - 129 For the public debate, with the whole spectrum of opinions until 1997, see a selection of texts by Petr Pithart and Petr Příhoda: *Čítanka odsunutých dějin*. For a typical nationalist argument, see Kvasnička, *Nepolepšitelní. Od Henleina k Neubaerovi*.
 - 130 *Právní aspekty odsunu sudetských Němců*; Kural, (ed.), *Studie o sudetoněmecké otázce; Krajské organizace sudetských Němců v SRN*. For a similar attempt, though with different intentions and backing, see Hahnová and Hahn, *Sudetoněmecké vzpomínání a zapomínání*.
 - 131 See especially Staněk's texts: *Německá menšina v českých zemích 1948–1989*; *Perzekuce 1945*; *Tábory v českých zemích 1945–1948*.
 - 132 For references, see Staněk, 'K situaci takzvaného státně nespolehlivého obyvatelstva v českých zemích v letech 1945–1948', in *Deset let soudobých dějin*, 44.
 - 133 Hahnová, *Sudetoněmecký problém: Obtížné loučení s minulostí*.
 - 134 Dejmek, Kuklík and Němeček, *Kauza: tzv. Benešovy dekrety*.
 - 135 *Historikové proti znásilňování dějin. Stanovisko sdružení historiků České republiky*. Cf. the section on the Czech 'Historikerstreit' below.
 - 136 *Rozumět dějinám. Vývoj česko-německých vztahů na našem území v letech 1848–1948*.

- 137 See Kolář, "Vertreibung zwischen nationaler Meistererzählung und Deutungspluralität. Der tschechische Vertreibungsdiskurs im Licht geschichtswissenschaftlicher Streitschriften".
- 138 Churaň, *Postupim a Československo, mýtus a skutečnost*. Cf. also the work of another 'critic' of the Decrees, who partly builds on Churaň's arguments: Mandler, *Benešovy dekrety, proč vznikly a co jsou*.
- 139 Tůma, "Czech Historiography of Contemporary History (1945–1989)".
- 140 The majority of these were published after 1989, e.g., Kaplan, *Nekrvavá revoluce; Pravda o Československu 1945–1948; Zpráva o zavraždění generálního tajemníka*.
- 141 Kaplan, *Pět kapitol o Únoru*.
- 142 See above all Kusák, *Kultura a politika v Československu 1945–1956*; Bauer, *Ideologie a paměť. Literatura a instituce na přelomu 40. a 50. let 20. století*; Knapík, *Únor a kultura. Sovětizace české kultury 1948–1950*.
- 143 See the survey in Janák, "Perzekuce a represe v letech 1948–1954", in *Deset let soudobých dějin*, 82–93. The paper contains an extensive bibliography, until 1999.
- 144 Kratochvíl, *Žalují* vols. 1–3; Hejl and Kaplan, *Zpráva o organizovaném násilí*.
- 145 Some of the major works are Kaplan, *Největší politický proces 'M. Horáková a spol.'*; id., *Nebezpečná bezpečnost. Státní bezpečnost v letech 1948–1956*; Koudelka, *Státní bezpečnost 1954–1968*; Jech, *Soumrak selského stavu 1945–1960*. See also <http://www.mvcr.cz/policie/udv/securita/index.html>
- 146 E.g., Cuhra, *Trestní represe odpůrců režimu v letech 1969–1972*; *Církevní politika KSČ a státu v letech 1969–1972*.
- 147 Blaive, *Promarněná příležitost. Československo a rok 1956*.
- 148 Benčík et al., *Osm měsíců pražského jara 1968*.
- 149 Pithart, *Osmadesátý*. The first edition was put out in exile in 1980.
- 150 Kural, (ed.), *Československo roku 1968*, vol. I, *Obrodný proces*; Mencl, (ed.), *Československo roku 1968*, vol. II, *Počátky normalizace*.
- 151 Měchýř, "Na okraj legendy roku 1968," and subsequent reactions in the section Diskuse (Discussion) in *Soudobé dějiny* 2–3/1994, 338–364.
- 152 See, e.g., the two positions in Navrátil and Vondrová, "Čtyři jednou ranou", in *Soudobé dějiny* 1–2/2003, 160–168; Kural, "K polemice kolem roku 1968 na stránkách Soudobých dějin", *ibid.*: 3/2003, 394–400.
- 153 Benčík, *Utajovaná pravda o Alexandru Dubčekovi: Drama muže, který předběhl svou dobu*.
- 154 Suk, "Alexandr Dubček—velký státník nebo politický symbol".
- 155 Otáhal, *Opozice, moc, společnost 1969/1989. Příspěvek k dějinám 'normalizace*.
- 156 Prečan, *Novoroční filipika 1995. Disent a Charta 77 v pojetí Milana Otáhala*; Otáhal, "Filipika místo diskuze aneb vyvážení mýtů".
- 157 A collection of memoirs and personal reflections on Charter 77 by both Chartists and non-Chartists: Cisařovská, Drápala, Prečan and Vančura, (eds.), *Charta 77 očima současníků po dvaceti letech*.

- 158 Suk, *Labyrintem revoluce. Aktéři, zápletky a křižovatky jedné politické krize*.
- 159 See Fulbrook, "Approaches to German Contemporary History Since 1945: Politics and Paradigms".
- 160 There are, for instance, projects on the social history of the 1950s and the 1960s, the Communist and radical socialist movements in Czechoslovakia since 1918. There is a team developing oral history projects and establishing an oral history archive for the post-war period. For some references, see the web pages of the Institute for Contemporary History in Prague: www.usd.cas.cz
- 161 Pánek, "Česká historická věda a české historické vědomí. Několik námětů do diskuze".
- 162 Dobeš and Zeman, "Skutečné a domnělé problémy české historiografie".
- 163 Nodl, "Krise české historiografie, aneb minulost, která chce být zapomenuta".
- 164 Schmidt-Hartmann, "Forty Years of Historiography under Socialism in Czechoslovakia. Continuity and Change in Patterns of Thought".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Michal Bauer, *Ideologie a paměť. Literatura a instituce na přelomu 40. a 50. let 20. století*. [Ideology and Memory. Literature and Institutions at the Turn of the 1940s and 1950s] (Jinočany: H&H, 2003)
- Antonín Benčík, Josef Domaňský, Jiří Hájek, Václav Kural, Václav Mencl, *Osm měsíců pražského jara 1968* [Eight Months of the Prague Spring 1968] (Prague: Práce, 1991)
- Antonín Benčík, *Utajovaná pravda o Alexandru Dubčekovi: Drama muže, který předběhl svou dobu*. [The Concealed Truth about Alexander Dubček. The Drama of a Man Who Outstripped His Time] (Prague: Ostrov, 2001)
- Michael Bentley, *Modern Historiography: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Muriel Blaive, *Promarněná příležitost. Československo a rok 1956* [Wasted Opportunity, Czechoslovakia and the Year 1956] (Prague: Prostor, 2001)
See also the French version, *Une déstalinisation 1956*. (Bruxelles: Complexe, 2005)
- Mečislav Borák, *Transport do tmy. První deportace evropských Židů*. [The Train to Darkness. The First Deportation of European Jews] (Ostrava: Moravskoslezský den, 1994)
- Eva Broklová, *Politická kultura německých aktivistických stran v Československu 1918–1938*. [Political Culture of German Activist Parties in Czechoslovakia 1918–1938] (Prague: Karolinum, 1999)
- Eva Broklová, "Politický nebo etnický národ?" [Political or Ethnic Nation?] *Český časopis historický*, 100, 2002, pp. 379–394.

- Radko Brach, *Československo a Evropa v polovině dvacátých let* [Czechoslovakia and Europe in the mid 1920s] (Prague-Litomyšl: Paseka, 1996)
- Václav Bůžek, "Šlechta v raném novověku v českém dějepisectví devadesátých let," [Early Modern Aristocracy in the Czech Historiography of the 1990s] in Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Aristokratické residence a dvory v raném novověku* [Aristocratic Residences and Courts in Early Modern Period] (České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 1999)
- Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Rezidence a dvory v raném novověku* [Residences and Courts in Early Modern Period] (České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 1999)
- Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti a zábavy na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech raného novověku* [Festivities at Courts and Residence Towns in Early Modern Period] (České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 2000)
- Václav Bůžek, ed., *Příspěvky ke každodenní kultuře novověku* [Contributions to the Everyday Culture in Modern Period] (České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 1995) [Opera Historica 4]
- Milan Churaň, *Postupim a Československo, mýtus a skutečnost* [Potsdam and Czechoslovakia, Myth and Reality] (Prague: Libri, 2001)
- Blanka Cisařovská, Milan Drápala, Vilém Prečan, Jiří Vančura, eds., *Charta 77 očima současníků po dvaceti letech* [Charter 77 By Actors' Eyes Twenty Years After] (Prague: Doplněk, 1997)
- John Connelly, *Captive University: the Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945–1956* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)
- John Connelly, Michael Güttner, eds., *Zwischen Autonomie und Anpassung: Universitäten in den Diktaturen des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003)
- Jaroslav Cuhra, *Trestní represe odpůrců režimu v letech 1969–1972* [Criminal Repression of the Regime's Adversaries 1969–1972] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 1997)
- Jaroslav Cuhra, *Církevní politika KSČ a státu v letech 1969–1972* [Church Politics of the CPCz and the State in 1969–1972] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 1999)
- Jaroslav Čechura, *Broumovská rebelie* [The Broumov Rebellion] (Prague: NLN, 1997)
- Jaroslav Čechura, "Mikrohistorie—nová perspektiva dějepisectví konce tisíciletí?" [Microhistory—a New Perspective of Historical Writing at the End of Millenium?], *Dějiny a současnost* 16, 1, 1994, pp. 2–5.
- Jaroslav Čechura, "Mor, krize a husitská revoluce," [Plague, Crisis, and the Hussite Revolution], *Český časopis historický* 92, 1994, pp. 286–303.
- Jaroslav Čechura, "Rolnictvo v Čechách v pozdním středověku: Perspektivy dalšího studia," [Peasantry in Bohemia in the Late Middle Ages: Perspectives of Studies], *Český časopis historický* 88, 1990, pp. 465–498.
- Jaroslav Čechura, "Rolnické revolty raného novověku: Přehled střeoevropského bádání," [Peasants' Revolts in Early Modern Period. An Outline

- of Central European Studies], *Český časopis historický* 97, 1999, 332–357.
- Jaroslav Čechura, *Selské rebelie roku 1680. Sociální konflikty v barokních Čechách a jejich každodenní souvislosti* [The Peasants' Revolts of 1680. Social Conflicts in Baroque Bohemia and their Everyday Life Context] (Prague: Libri, 2001)
- Češi, Němci, odsun. *Diskuze nezávislých akademiků* [Czechs, Germans, Transfer. Discussion of Independent Scholars] (Prague: Academia, 1990)
- Ivana Čornejová, *Tovaryšstvo Ježíšovo. Jezuíté v Čechách* [The Society of Jesus. The Jesuits in Bohemia] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1995)
- Jindřich Dejmek, Kamil Krofta. *Historik v čele diplomacie*. [Kamil Krofta. A Historian Leading Diplomacy] (Prague: Karolinum, 1998)
- Jindřich Dejmek, Jan Kuklík, Jan Němeček, *Kauza: tzv. Benešovy dekrety. Historické kořeny a souvislosti. Tři české hlasy v diskuzi* [The Case of the So-Called Beneš Decrees. Historical Roots and Context. Three Czech Voices In a Discussion] (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 1999)
- Jindřich Dejmek, Jan Kuklík and Jan Němeček, *Dějiny zemí Koruny české* Vol. 2, [The History of the Bohemian Crown Lands] Pavel Bělina et al., (Prague: Paseka, 2002) [8th ed.]
- Jan Dobeš and Pavel Zeman, 'Skutečné a domnělé problémy české historiografie' [Real and Seeming Problems of Czech Historiography] in *VIII. sjezd českých historiků, Hradec Králové 10.-12. září 1999* [VI Congress of Czech Historians], Jiří Pešek, ed., (Prague: Scriptorium, 2000), pp. 107–111.
- Jan Dobeš and Pavel Zeman, 'Forum: O sudetoněmecké otázce.' [Forum: on the Sudeten-German Question], *Soudobé dějiny*, 1, 2–3 (1994), pp. 236–292.
- Mary Fulbrook, "Approaches to German Contemporary History Since 1945: Politics and Paradigms," *Zeithistorische Forschungen*, 1, 1 (2004), pp. 31–50.
- Dan Gawrecki, "Die Arbeiterbewegung im Industriegebiet von Mährisch-Ostrau im Spiegel der tschechoslowakischen Historiographie nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg," *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für Soziale Bewegungen* 23 (2000), pp. 61–73.
- Jan Gebhart, 'Historiography on the Period 1938–1945.' in *Czech Historiography in the 1990s*, (Prague: *Historica* 7–8 [2000–2001]), pp. 150–155.
- Jan Gebhart, Jan Kuklík, *Dramatické a všední dny protektorátu* [Dramatic and Ordinary Days of the Protectorate] (Prague: Themis, 1996)
- Jan Gebhart, Jan Kuklík, *Druhá republika 1938–1939. Svár demokracie a totality v politickém, společenském a kulturním životě* [The Second Republic 1938–1939. Dissension of Democracy and Totality in Political, Social and Cultural Life] (Prague: Paseka, 2004)
- Miroslav Gregorovič, *Kapitoly o českém fašismu* [Chapters about Czech Fascism] (Prague: Lidové noviny, 1995)

- Eva Hahnová, *Sudetoněmecký problém: Obtížné loučení s minulostí*. [Sudeten-German Problem: Troublesome Farewell to the Past] (Prague: Prago média, 1996; Ústí nad Labem: Albis international, 1998)
- Eva Hahnová and Hans Henning Hahn, *Sudetoněmecké vzpomínání a zapominání* [Sudeten-German Remembering and Forgetting] (Prague: Votobia, 2002)
- Miloš Havelka, ed., *Spor o smysl českých dějin* [The Controversy about the Meaning of Czech History] (Prague: Torst, 1995)
- Miloš Havelka, *Smysl a dějiny* [Meaning and History] (Prague: NLN, 2001)
- Josef Harna, "Historiography on the First Czechoslovak Republic, 1918–1938," in *Czech historiography in the 1990s* (Prague: Historica 7–8 [2000–2001])
- Vilém Hejl, Karel Kaplan, *Zpráva o organizovaném násilí* [Report on Organized Violence] (Prague: Univerzum, 1990)
- Pavel Himl, "Nová košťata sociálního ukáznování a mikrohistorie: Broumovská rebelie Jaroslava Čechury," [New Brooms of Social Discipline and Microhistory. On Jaroslav Čechura's *Broumovská Rebelie*], *Listy filologické* 123, 2000, pp. 166–180.
- Pavel Himl, *Die 'armen Leüte' und die Macht. Die Untertanen der südböhmischen Herrschaft Český Krumlov/Krumau im Spannungsfeld zwischen Gemeinde, Obrigkeit und Kirche (1680–1781)* (Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 2003)
- Pavel Himl, *Historikové a kauza Lety* [Historians and the Case of Lety] (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 1999)
- Pavel Himl, *Historikové proti znásilňování dějin. Stanovisko sdružení historiků České republiky* [Historians Against the Violation of History. A Standpoint of the Association of Historians in the Czech Republic] (Prague: appendix of the *Zpravodaj Historického klubu*, 2001/2)
- Zdeněk Hojda, "Idola barokního bádání aneb jak se vyhnout Sklyle a neupadnout v osidla Charybdy," [The "Phantom" of Baroque Studies or How to Avoid Scylla without Being Drawn into Charybdis] in Zdeněk Hojda ed., *Kultura baroka v Čechách a Moravě* [Baroque Culture in Bohemia and Moravia] (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 1992)
- Pavla Horská, *Naše prababičky feministky* [Our Great-grandmothers Feminists] (Prague: NLN, 1999)
- Pavla Horská, "Umíme napsat dějiny společnosti českých zemí 19. století?" [Can We Write a History of the Society in the Bohemian Lands in the 19th Century?], *Český časopis historický* 95, 1997, pp. 847–857.
- Miroslav Hroch, *Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den kleinen Völkern Europas* (Prague: Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philosophica et Historica 24, 1968)
- Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Miroslav Hroch, *V národním zájmu* [In the National Interest] (Prague: Filozofická fakulta UK, 1996)

- Miroslav Hroch, *Na prahu národní existence* [On the Threshold of National Existence] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1999)
- Miroslav Hroch and Josef Petráň, *Das 17. Jahrhundert—Krise der Feudalgesellschaft?* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1981)
- Milan Hübl, *Češi, Slováci a jejich sousedé* [Czechs, Slovaks, and their Neighbors] (Prague: Naše vojsko, 1990)
- Wilma Iggers, 'Das verlorene Paradies,' in Monika Flacke, ed., *Mythen der Nationen. 1945 – Arena der Erinnerungen* (Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern, 2004), pp. 773–798.
- Dušan Janák, "Perzekuce a represe v letech 1948–1954," [Persecution and Repression in 1948–1954] in Jiří Kocian and Oldřich Tůma eds., *Deset let soudobých dějin* [Ten years of recent history] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 2001), pp. 82–93.
- Drahomír Jančík, *Třetí říše a rozklad Malé Dohody* [The Third Reich and the Dissolution of the Little Entente] (Prague: Karolinum, 1999)
- Karel Jech, *Soumrak selského stavu 1945–1960* [The Twilight of Peasantry 1945–1960] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 2001)
- František Jederman [Petr Příhoda], *Ztracené dějiny* [The Lost History] (Prague: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 1990)
- Zdeněk Kalista, *Tvář baroka* [The Face of Baroque] (Prague: SPN, 1992)
- Zdeněk Kalista, *Století andělů a ďáblů. Jihočeský barok* [The Century of Angels and Demons. The South Bohemian Baroque] (Jinočany: H & H, 1994)
- Karel Kaplan, *Nebezpečná bezpečnost. Státní bezpečnost v letech 1948–1956* [Insecure Security. The State Security Service in the Years 1948–1956] (Brno: Doplněk, 1999)
- Karel Kaplan, *Nekrvavá revoluce* [Bloodless Revolution] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1993)
- Karel Kaplan, *Největší politický proces 'M. Horáková a spol.'* [The Greatest Political Trial. 'M. Horáková and Others.']] (Brno: Doplněk, 1996)
- Karel Kaplan, *Pravda o Československu 1945–1948* [The Truth about Czechoslovakia 1945–1948] (Prague: 1990)
- Karel Kaplan, *Zpráva o zavraždění generálního tajemníka* [Report On the Murder of the Secretary General] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1992)
- Karel Kaplan, *Pět kapitol o Únoru* [Five Chapters About February] (Brno: Doplněk, 1997)
- Zdeněk Kárník, *České země v éře první republiky (1918–1938)* [The Czech Lands in the Era of the First Republic [1918–1938], Vol.1, *Vznik, budování a zlatá léta republiky (1918–1929)* [The Origins, the Formation, and the Golden Years of the Republic 1918–1929] (Prague: NLN, 2000), Vol. 2, *Československo a české země v krizi a ohrožení (1930–35)* [Czechoslovakia and Czech Lands in Crisis and Peril] (Prague: NLN, 2002), Vol 3. *O přežití a o život (1936–1938)* [For Survival and Existence 1936–1938] (Prague: NLN, 2003)

- Zdeněk Kárník and Michal Kopeček, eds., *Bolševismus, komunismus a radikální socialismus v Československu*, Vol. 1–5 [Bolshevism, Communism and Radical Socialism in Czechoslovakia] (Prague: Dokořán – ÚSD AV ČR, 2003–2005)
- Miroslav Kárný et al., *Terezínská pamětní kniha. Židovské oběti nacistických deportací z Čech a Moravy 1941–1945*, Vol. 1 and 2 [Terezín Memorial Book. Jewish Victims of Nazi Deportation from Bohemia and Moravia 1941–1945] (Prague: Melantrich, 1995)
- Vlasta Kladivová, *Konečná stanice Auschwitz-Birkenau* [The Final Destination Auschwitz-Birkenau] (Olomouc: Pedagogická fakulta University Palackého, 1994)
- Antonín Klimek, *Říjen 1918. Vznik Československa*. [October 1918. Origins of Czechoslovakia] (Prague-Litomyšl: Paseka, 1998)
- Antonín Klimek, *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české, Vol. XIII, 1918–1929* [The King-size History of the Lands of the Czech Crown, Vol. XIII, 1918–1929] (Prague-Litomyšl: Paseka, 2000)
- Antonín Klimek, *Boj o Hrad*, Vol. 1, 2 [The Struggle for ‘Castle’] (Prague: Panevropa, 1996, 1998)
- Antonín Klimek, Eduard Kubů, *Československá zahraniční politika 1918–1938* [Czechoslovak Foreign Policy 1918–1938] (Prague: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 1995)
- Antonín Klimek, Petr Hofmann, *Vítěz, který prohrál: General Radola Gajda* [The Victor Who Lost. General Radola Gajda] (Prague—Litomyšl: Paseka, 1995)
- Árpád von Klimó, “Das Ende der Nationalismusforschung? Bemerkungen zu einigen Neuerscheinungen zu “Politische Religion,” “Fest” und “Erinnerung,”” *Neue Politische Literatur* 48 (2003), 271–291.
- Martin Kohli, “‘Von uns selbst schweigen wir.’ Wissenschaftsgeschichte aus Lebensgeschichten,” in Wolf Lepenies, ed., *Geschichte der Soziologie. Studien zur kognitiven, sozialen und historischen Identität einer Disziplin*, Vol. 1, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1981) pp. 428–465.
- Pavel Kolář, “Vertreibung zwischen nationaler Meistererzählung und Deutungspluralität. Der tschechische Vertreibungsdiskurs im Licht geschichtswissenschaftlicher Streitschriften,” in Jürgen Danyel, Philipp Ther, eds., *Nach der Vertreibung: Geschichte und Gegenwart einer kontroversen Erinnerung* [Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 53, 10, (2005)], pp. 925–940.
- Marie Koldinská, *Každodennost renesančního aristokrata*, [Everyday Life of the Renaissance Aristocrat] (Prague—Litomyšl: Paseka, 2001)
- Michal Kopeček and Miroslav Kunštát, “‘Sudetoněmecká otázka’ v české akademické debatě po r. 1989,” [‘The Sudeten-German issue’ in Czech Academic Discussion After 1989], *Soudobé dějiny*, 10, 3 (2003), pp. 293–318.
- Jiří Kořalka, *Češi v habsburské říši a v Evropě 1815–1914* [The Czechs in the Habsburg Empire, 1815–1914] (Prague: Argo, 1996)

- František Koudelka, *Státní bezpečnost 1954–1968* [State Security 1954–1968] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 1993)
- Jiří Kovtun, *Masarykův triumf* [The Triumph of Masaryk] (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1987)
- Jiří Knapík, *Únor a kultura. Sovětizace české kultury 1948–1950* [The ‘February’ and Culture. The Sovietization of Czech Culture 1948–1950] (Prague: Libri, 2004)
- Pavel Král, *Pohřební slavnosti jako prostředek a místo komunikace raně novověké společnosti* [Funeral Festivities as a Means and Space of Communication in Early Modern Society], in Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti*, pp. 315–332.
- Antonín Kratochvíl, *Žalují* Vol. 1-2, [I’accuse] (Prague: Dolmen, 1990)
- Otomar L. Krejča, “Český fašismus,” [Czech Fascism], *Soudobé dějiny*, 11, 1–2 (2004), pp. 11–55.
- Jan Křen, *Konfliktní společenství: Češi a Němci 1780–1918* [A Conflict Community: Czechs and Germans, 1780–1918] (Prague: Academia, 1990)
- Eduard Kubů, *Německo—zahraničně politické dilemma Edvarda Beneše* [Germany—the Foreign Policy Dilemma of Edvard Beneš] (Prague: Karolinum, 1994)
- Eduard Kubů, Jaroslav Pátek, *Mýtus a realita hospodářské vyspělosti Československa mezi světovými válkami* [Myth and Reality of the Czechoslovak Economic Advancement in the Inter-War Period] (Prague: Karolinum, 2000)
- Eduard Kubů, Helga Schultz, eds., *Wirtschaftsnationalismus als Entwicklungsstrategie ostmitteleuropäischer Eliten* (Prague: Aleš Skřivan, 2004)
- Jaroslav Kučera, *Minderheit im Nationalstaat. Die Sprachenfrage in den tschechisch-deutschen Beziehungen 1918–1938*. [Minority in Nation State. The Language Question in the Czech–German Relations 1918–1938] (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999)
- Jaroslav Kučera, “Politický či přirozený národ?” [Political or Natural Nation?] *Český časopis historický*, 99, 2001, pp. 550–568.
- Jaroslav Kučera, “Česká historiografie a odsun Němců. Pokus o bilanci čtyř let,” [Czech Historiography and the Transfer of Germans. An Attempt at Balance of Four Years’ Account] *Soudobé dějiny*, 2, 2–3 (1994), pp. 365–373.
- Václav Kural, ed., *Československo roku 1968: Obrodny process*, Vol. 1 [Czechoslovakia 1968: the Process of Regeneration] (Prague: Parta, 1993)
- Václav Kural, “K polemice kolem roku 1968 na stránkách Soudobých dějin,” [To the debate on 1968 in Soudobé dějiny], *Soudobé dějiny*, 10, 3 (2003), pp. 394–400.
- Václav Kural, ed., *Krajanské organizace sudetských Němců v SRN* [Land Organizations of Sudeten-Germans in the FRG] (Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 1998)

- Václav Kural, ed., *Místo společenství konflikt! Češi a Němci ve Velkoněmecké říši a cesta k odsunu 1938–1945* [Conflict Instead of Partnership! Czechs and Germans in the Greater German Reich and the Road to the Transfer 1938–1945] (Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 1994)
- Václav Kural, ed., *Studie o sudetoněmecké otázce* [Studies about the Sudeten–German Question] (Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 1996)
- Alexej Kusák, *Kultura a politika v Československu 1945–1956* [Culture and Politics in Czechoslovakia 1945–1956] (Prague: Torst, 1998)
- Václav Kvasnička, *Nepolepšitelní. Od Henleina k Neubaerovi* [Incorrigibles. From Henlein to Neubauer] (Prague: Futura, 1996)
- Vlastislav Lacina, *Zlatá léta československého hospodářství 1918–1929* [The Golden Years of the Czechoslovak Economy 1918–1929] (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2000)
- Hans Lemberg, “Vývoj plánů na vysídlení Němců z Československa” [Making Plans to Transfer Germans from Czechoslovakia] in Ivonka Řezanková, Václav Kural, eds., *Cesta do katastrofy. Československo–německé vztahy 1938–1945* [The Road to Disaster. Czechoslovak–German Relations 1938–1945] (Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 1993), pp. 59–69.
- Milena Lenderová, *K hříchu i k modlitbě: žena v 19. století* [Sin and Prayer: The Woman in the 19th Century] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1999)
- Gabriele Lingelbach, *Klio macht Karriere. Die Institutionalisierung der Geschichtswissenschaft in Frankreich und den USA in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003)
- Alf Lüdtke, ed., *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experience and Ways of Life* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995)
- Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích (1471–1526)* [The Jagellonian Age in the Bohemian Lands, 1471–1526] 1. Hospodářská základna a královská moc [Economic Base and Royal Power] (Prague: Academia, 1992), 2. Šlechta [Aristocracy] (Prague: Academia, 1994), 3. Města [Towns] (Prague: Academia, 1998), 4. Venkovský lid. Národnostní otázka [Peasantry. Ethnic Question], (Prague: Academia, 1999)
- Jana Machačová, Jiří Matějček, “Sociální historiografie období industrializace českých zemí z let 1990–2000,” [The Studies of Social History of the Industrialization Period in the Bohemian Lands for years 1990–2000], *Český časopis historický* 99, 2001, pp. 294–312.
- Jana Machačová, Jiří Matějček, *Německá menšina v českých zemích 1948–1989* [The German Minority in the Bohemian Lands 1948–1989] (Prague: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 1993)
- Jana Machačová, Jiří Matějček, *Perzekuce 1945. Perzekuce tzv. státně nespolehlivého obyvatelstva v českých zemích—mimo tábory a věznice—v květnu a srpnu 1945* [Persecution 1945. The Persecution of the So-Called State-Untrustworthy Inhabitants in the Czech Lands—except Camps and Prisons—in May and August 1945] (Prague: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku, 1996)

- Jana Macháčová, Jiří Matějček, *Tábory v českých zemích 1945–1948* [Camps in the Bohemian Lands 1945–1948] (Opava-Šenov u Ostravy: Tilia, 1996)
- Jana Macháčová, Jiří Matějček, “K situaci takzvaného státně nespolehlivého obyvatelstva v českých zemích v letech 1945–1948,” [The Situation of the So-Called State-Untrustworthy Inhabitants in the Bohemian Lands in 1945–1948] in *Deset let soudobých dějin*, pp. 44–55.
- Jitka Malečková, *Úrodná puda. Žena ve službách národa* [Fertile Soil: Woman in the Service of Nation] (Prague: ISV nakladatelství, 2002)
- Vladimír Macura, *Znamení zrodu* [The Sign of Birth] (Jinočany: H & H, 1995)
- Jiří Malíř, “Bürgertum in Mähren zwischen Prag und Wien,” in Hannes Stekl et al., *Bürgertum in der Habsburger Monarchie* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1992)
- Jiří Malíř, *Od spolkům k moderním politickým stranám* [From Associations to Modern Political Parties] (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1996)
- Emanuel Mandler, *Benešovy dekrety, proč vznikly a co jsou* [Beneš's Decrees, Why They Originated and What They Are] (Prague: Libri, 2002)
- Jaroslav Marek, *Česká moderní kultura* [Modern Czech Culture] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1998)
- Jaroslav Marek, František Šmahel, “Škola Annales v zrcadle českého dějepisectví,” [The Annales-School as Mirrored in the Czech Historiography], *Český časopis historický* 97, 1999, pp. 1–17.
- Roger D. Markwik, *Rewriting History in Soviet Russia: The Politics of Revisionist Historiography 1956–1974* (New York: Palgrave, 2001)
- Petr Maťa, “Karneval v životě a myšlení raně novověké šlechty,” [Carneval in Life and Thought of Early Modern Aristocracy] in Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti*, pp. 163–187.
- Petr Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)*, [The World of Bohemian Aristocracy (1500–1700)] (Prague: NLN, 2004)
- Jan Měchýř, “Na okraj legendy roku 1968,” [On the Margins of a Legend] *Soudobé dějiny* 1, 1 (1993), pp. 11–23.
- Václav Mencl, ed., *Československo roku 1968: Počátky normalizace*, Vol. 2 [Czechoslovakia 1968: The Beginnings of the Normalization] (Prague: Parta, 1993)
- Thomas Mergel, “Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, 2002, pp. 574–606.
- Jaroslav Mezník, *Praha před husitskou revolucí* [Prague on the Eve of the Hussite Revolution], (Prague: Academia, 1990)
- Jaroslav Mezník, “Mor z roku 1380 a příčiny husitské revoluce,” [The Plague of 1380 and the Causes of the Hussite Revolution], *Český časopis historický* 93, 1995, 702–710.
- Matthias Middell, Gabriele Lingelbach, eds., *Historische Institute im internationalen Vergleich* (Leipzig: Akademische Verlaganstalt, 2001)
- David E. Miller, *Forging Political Compromise. Antonín Švehla and the Czechoslovak Republican Party, 1918–1933* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999)

- Miloslav Moulis, *Vzestup a pád generála Gajdy* [The Rise and Fall of General Gajda] (Třebíč: Akcent, 2000)
- Milan Nakonečný, *Vlajka. K historii a ideologii českého nacionalismu* [Vlajka. To the History and Ideology of Czech Nationalism] (Prague: Chvojkoovo nakladatelství, 2001)
- Jaromír Navrátil, Jitka Vondrová, "Čtyři jednou ranou," [Four by one stroke], *Soudobé dějiny* 10, 1–2 (2003), pp. 160–168.
- Ctibor Nečas, *Českoslovenští Romové v letech 1938–1945* [Czechoslovak Romas in the Years 1938–1945] (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1994)
- Ctibor Nečas, *Holocaust českých Romů* [The Holocaust of the Czech Roma] (Prague: Prostor, 1997)
- Martin Nodl, "Krise české historiografie, aneb minulost, která chce být zapomenuta," [The Crisis of Czech Historiography or the Past that Desires to Be Forgotten], in *VIII. sjezd českých historiků, Hradec Králové 10.–12. září 1999* [Eighth Congress of Czech Historians], Jiří Pešek, ed. (Prague: Scriptorium, 2000), pp. 99–106.
- Martin Nodl, "Předhusitské mory—k problémům jedné interpretace," [Plagues in the Pre-Hussite Period—on the Difficulties of an Interpretation], *Časopis matice moravské* 120, 2001, pp. 491–503.
- Marie Neudorfllová, *České ženy v 19. století. Úsilí a sny, úspěchy i zklamání na cestě k emancipaci* [Czech Women in the 19th Century, Efforts and Dreams, Achievements and Disappointments on the Road to Emancipation] (Prague: Janua, 1999)
- Jaroslav Opat, *Filozof a politik T.G.Masaryk, 1882–1893* [The Philosopher and Politician T.G.Masaryk, 1882–1893] (Prague: Melantrich, 1990)
- Milan Otáhal, *Opozice, moc a společnost 1969–1989. Příspěvek k dějinám normalizace* [Opposition, Power and Society 1969–1989. A Contribution to the History of Normalization] (Prague: Maxdorf, 1994)
- Milan Otáhal, *Normalizace 1969–1989. Příspěvek ke stavu bádání*. [Normalization, 1969–1989. A Contribution to the State of the Art] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 2002)
- Milan Otáhal, "Filipika místo diskuze aneb vyvážení mýtů," [Philippics Instead of Discussion or Myth-Making], *Soudobé dějiny*, 3, 2 (1995), pp. 93–107.
- Jaroslav Pánek, "Česká historická věda a české historické vědomí. Několik námětů do diskuze," [Czech Historical Scholarship and Czech Historical Consciousness. Few Discussion Incentives] *Český časopis historický*, 97, 1999, pp. 311–320.
- Jaroslav Pánek, "Šlechta v raně novověké Evropě z pohledu českého a evropského bádání," [Aristocracy in Early Modern Europe in Czech and European Historical Studies]. In Václav Bůžek, ed., *Život na dvorech barokní šlechty (1600–1750)* [The Life at the Courts of Baroque Aristocracy (1600–1750)] (*Opera Historica* 5, České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 1996) pp. 19–45.

- Markus Pape, *A nikdo vám nebude věřit. Dokument o koncentračním táboře Lety u Písku*. [And Nobody Will Believe You. A Documentary about a Concentration Camp in Lety near Písek] (Prague: G plus G, 1997)
- Tomáš Pasák, *Pod ochranou říše* [Under the Protection of the Reich] (Prague: Práh, 1998)
- Tomáš Pasák, *Český fašismus 1922–1945 a kolaborace 1939–1945* [Czech Fascism 1922–1945 and Collaboration 1939–1945] (Prague: Práh, 1999)
- Josef Petráň et al., *Dějiny hmotné kultury* [History of Material Culture], Vol. 1–3, (Prague: SPN-Karolinum, 1985–1997)
- Helena Petrův, *Právní postavení židů v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava (1939–1941)* [Juristic Position of Jews in Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia 1939–1941] (Prague: Sefer, 2000)
- Jiří Pešek, “Německá diskuse z let 1985–1992 o tématu Bürgertum, Bildungsbürgertum konce 18. až počátku 20. století,” [The German Debate on Bürgertum and Bildungsbürgertum from the Late 18th to the Early 20th Century [1985–1992], *Český časopis historický* 92, 1994, pp. 104–121.
- Jiří Pešek, *Od aglomerace k velkoměstu. Praha a středoevropské metropole 1850–1920* [From Agglomeration to Metropolis. Prague and Central European Metropolises, 1850–1920] (Prague: Scriptorium, 1999)
- Petr Pithart, Petr Příhoda, *Čítanka odsunutých dějin* [A Reader of Expelled History] (Prague: Prago media news, 1998)
- Petr Pithart, *Osmašedesátý* [Sixty Eight] (Prague: Rozmluvy, 1990)
- Paul Polansky, *Dvakrát tím samým. Básně o romském holocaustu*. [Twice the Same. Poems About the Roma Holocaust] (Prague: G plus G, 1998)
- Paul Polansky, *Těživé mlčení. Svědectví těch, kteří přežili Lety* [Burdensome Silence. The Testimony of Those Who Survived Lety] (Prague: G plus G, 1998)
- Josef Polišínský, *The Thirty Years' War* (Berkeley, UCL Press, 1971)
- Právní aspekty odsunu sudetských Němců* [Legal Aspects of the Transfer of the Sudeten-Germans] (Prague: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 1996)
- Vilém Prečan, *Novoroční filipika 1995. Disent a Charta 77 v pojetí Milana Otáhal*, [New Year's Philippic 1995. Dissent and Charter 77 in Milan Otáhal's Conception] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 1995)
- Vilém Prečan, “Pět let Ústavu pro soudobé dějiny,” [Five Years of the Institute of Contemporary History] in *Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR* [Institute of Contemporary History] (Prague: ÚSD AV ČR, 1995), pp. 1–6.
- Jiří Rak, *Bývali Čechové. České historické mýty a stereotypy* [Czech They Were. Czech Historical Myths and Stereotypes] (Jinočany: H & H, 1994)
- Lutz Raphael, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeitalter der Extreme. Theorien, Methoden, Tendenzen von 1900 bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: Beck, 2003)
- Jan Rataj, *O autoritativní národní stát. Ideologické proměny české politiky ve druhé republice 1938–1939* [For an Authoritarian Nation State. Ideological Metamorphoses of Czech Politics in the Second Republic, 1938–1939] (Prague: Karolinum, 1997)

- Rozumět dějinám. *Vývoj česko-německých vztahů na našem území v letech 1848–1948* [Understanding History: the Development of Czech–German Relations at Our Territory in Years 1848–1948] (Prague: Gallery, 2002)
- Jacques Rupnik, *Dějiny Komunistické strany Československa. Od počátků do převzetí moci*. [The History of the CPCz. From the Beginnings to the Seizure of Power] (Prague: Academia, 2002)
- Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, “Forty Years of Historiography under Socialism in Czechoslovakia. Continuity and Change in Patterns of Thought,” *Bohemia* 29, 1988, pp. 300–324.
- Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk’s Realism. The Origins of a Czech Political Concept*. (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1984)
- Christian Simon, *Historiographie. Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart: Ulmer, 1996)
- Zdeněk Sládek, *Malá dohoda 1919–1938. Její hospodářské, politické a vojenské komponenty*. [Little Entente 1919–1938. Its Economic, Political and Military Aspects] (Prague: Karolinum, 2000)
- Tomáš Staněk, *Odsun Němců z Československa 1945–1947* [The Transfer of Germans from Czechoslovakia 1945–1947] (Prague: Academia, 1991)
- Blanka Soukupová, *Český sebevědomý sen a evropská realita* [The Self-Confident Czech Dream and the European Reality] (Prague: Sofis, 2001)
- Dana Štefanová, Václav Bůžek, eds., *Menschen–Handlungen–Strukturen. Historisch-Antropologische Zugangsweisen in den Geschichtswissenschaften* (*Opera Historica* 9, České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 2001)
- Jiří Suk, “Alexandr Dubček—velký státník nebo politický symbol?” [Alexander Dubček – Statesman or Political Symbol?], *Soudobé dějiny*, 9, 1 (2002), pp. 92–103.
- Jiří Suk, *Labyrintem revoluce. Aktéři, zápletky a křižovatky jedné politické krize*. [Through the Labyrinth of the Revolution. Actors, Plots and Crossroads in a Political Crisis] (Prague: Prostor, 2003)
- Ivan Šedivý, *Češi, české země a velká válka 1914–1918* [Czechs, the Bohemian Lands and the Great War, 1914–1918] (Prague: NLN, 2001)
- Jana Šetřilová, *Alois Rašín* (Prague: Argo, 1997)
- Alena Šimůnková, “Status, odpovědnost a láska: vztahy mezi mužem a ženou v české měšťanské společnosti v 19. století,” [Status, Responsibility, and Love: Gender Relations in the 19th-Century Czech Middle-Class Society], *Český časopis historický* 95, 1997, pp. 55–109.
- František Šmahel, *Husitská revoluce* [The Hussite Revolution], vol. 1. (Prague: Historický ústav AV ČR 1993)
- František Šmahel, *Husitské Čechy. Struktury, procesy, ideje*. [Hussite Bohemia. Structures, Processes, Ideas] (Prague: NLN, 2001)
- Jiří Štaif, “The Image of the Other in the 19th Century: Historical Scholarship in the Czech Lands,” in Nancy Wingfield, ed., *Creating the Other. Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003)

- Jiří Štaif, "Die tschechische Historiographie zur Sozialgeschichte der böhmischen Länder [1526–1848] vor und nach dem Jahre 1989. Versuch einer ersten Bilanz," *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für Soziale Bewegungen* 23 (2000), pp. 11–26.
- Alice Teichová, *Mezinárodní kapitál a Československo v letech 1918–1938* [International Capital and Czechoslovakia in 1918–1938] (Prague: Karolinum, 1994)
- Daniela Tinková, *Hřích, zločin, šílenství v čase odkouzlování světa* [Sin, Crime, and Madness in the Age of Disenchantment of the World] (Prague: Argo, 2004)
- Rolf Torstendahl, Irmeline Veit-Brause, eds., *History-Making. The Intellectual and Social Formation of a Discipline* (Stockholm: International Committee for Historical Sciences / Commission of the History of Historiography 1996)
- Dušan Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců. Vstup Čechů do dějin* [The Beginnings of Přemyslides. The Entrance of the Czechs in History] (Prague: NLN, 1997)
- Otto Urban, *Kapitalismus a česká společnost* [Capitalism and Czech Society] (Prague: Svoboda, 1978)
- Otto Urban, *Česká společnost 1848–1914* [Czech Society, 1848–1914] (Prague: Svoboda, 1982)
- Josef Válka, "Barokní slavnosti," [Baroque Festivities], in Zdeněk Hojda, ed., *Kultura baroka*, pp. 53–63.
- Josef Válka, "Homo festivans," in Václav Bůžek, Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti*, pp. 5–17.
- Josef Válka, "Problém baroka jako kulturní a historické epochy," [The Problem of Baroque as a Cultural and Historical Epoch], in Milan Kopecký, ed., *O barokní kultuře* [On Baroque Culture] (Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1968)
- Josef Válka, "Nové dějepisectví a české dějiny," [The Nouvelle Histoire and Czech History], *Časopis matice moravské* 116, 1998, pp. 645–475.
- Vít Vlnas, *Jan Nepomuk. Česká legenda* [John of Nepomuk. A Bohemian Legend] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 1993)
- Vít Vlnas, *Princ Evžen Savojský. Život a sláva barokního válečníka* [Prince Eugen of Savoy. Life and Glory of the Baroque Warrior] (Prague, Lito-myšl: Paseka 2001)
- Petr Vorel, 'Aristokratické svatby v Čechách a na Moravě v 16. Století jako prostředek společenské komunikace a stavovské diplomacie,' [Aristocratic Weddings in Bohemia and Moravia in the 16th Century as a Means of Communication and Estates Diplomacy] in Václav Bůžek and Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti*, pp. 191–206.
- Pavla Vošahlíková, *Žak se žilo za časů Františka Josefa* [The Everyday Life in the Age of Francis Joseph I] (Prague: Svoboda, 1996)

Pavla Vošahlíková, *Vom Amts Wegen: k.k. Beamte erzählen* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1998)

Zdeněk Vybíral, "Stavovství a dějiny moci v českých zemích na prahu novověku. Nové cesty ke starému tématu," [The Estates and History of Power in Bohemian Lands at the Beginning of Early Modern Period: New Roads to an Old Theme], *Český časopis historický* 99, 2001, pp. 725–759.

Zbyněk Zeman, Antonín Klimek, *The Life of Edvard Beneš, 1884–1948. Czechoslovakia in Peace and War* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); the Czech version: Zbyněk Zeman, *Edvard Beneš. Politický životopis* [Edvard Beneš. A Political Biography] (Prague: Mladá fronta, 2000)

Josef Žemlička, *Čechy v době knížecí* [Bohemia in the Age of Principality] (Prague: NLN, 1997)

Volker Zimmermann, *Die Sudetendeutschen im NS-Staat Politik und Stimmung der Bevölkerung im Reichsgau Sudetenland* (Essen: Klartext, 1999)

Zora Hlavičková

Wedged Between National and Trans-National History: Slovak Historiography in the 1990s¹

1. IN SEARCH OF NATIONAL HISTORY

Invariably, each political nation aspires for its own history. The subject of this paper on Slovak historiography is precisely a political nation's effort to reflect and partly construct its own history in Central Europe. This effort is obviously a part of a broader national project, placing a single ethnic group in the center of historiographical interest with the aim of proving its historical-political claim to statehood, whether it is already a reality or not. If there is a specific historical state territory that can be introduced into this historiographic conception, the political history of this state is usually studied from the point of view of the emancipation and state formation of the selected nation. However, the question is more complicated in our case, the case of Slovakia.

In the period when national consciousness began to appear and spread, the Slovak ethnic group was part of the multi-ethnic Hungarian state, whose traditions reached far back into the early Middle Ages. Therefore, it was very hard to speak of any original Slovak state territory. While, before 1918, there was some interest in finding points of contact between Slovak and Czech history, the mainstream of the intelligentsia of the time refused to understand Slovak history as part of Hungarian history, Czech history, or Czechoslovak history.²

The year 1918 brought a fundamental change. With the creation of a common state and the Czechoslovakist project aiming at establishing the Czechoslovak political nation, a distinctively Czechoslovak history was envisioned. Such a history was understood as one of the pre-conditions for the legitimacy of the newly formed state. However, the understanding of the origin of the Czechoslovak state was different in its two

parts (leaving aside the problem of the Sub-Carpathian Ruthenians). While the Czechs understood Czechoslovakia as the renewal of national independence lost since 1620, the Slovaks sought in Czechoslovakia an independent state-formation denied to them by the Hungarians.

From the Czech point of view, Slovakia was understood as just an extension of the original Czech state and so also its history. From the Slovak point of view, the impression arose that the Czechs believed that up to 1918 the Slovaks had been part of Hungary, and now they should integrate into the Czech-led Czechoslovak whole from the point of view of both the history as well as the state. On the Czech side, this situation was grounded in generally very little interest and sensitivity for the Slovak national emancipation process. Yet, in the cultural-political atmosphere of the Kingdom of Hungary Slovaks had developed a truly different heritage. The wish to overcome this distinctiveness was the reason why Czechs tended to think about their new compatriots as about the "Slovak branch of the Czechoslovak nation". Furthermore, this difference due to the relative temporal lag of the Slovak national emancipation was interpreted in a simplified way, as a kind of backwardness: the Slovak nation was simply at a lower level of economic, administrative, and educational development and was in need to be improved by Czech contributions. Moreover, the relative lack of local intellectual elites and skilled administrative personnel led to a significant transfer of Czech intelligentsia to Slovakia in the first decade of the republic, which naturally also contributed to the feeling of Czech cultural dominance.

Also in historiography Czech historians prevailed among the staff of the new university in Bratislava, founded in 1921. However, as in other areas, this transitional period witnessed the birth of a domestic Slovak-language historical science, which went its own way, independent of Czech or Hungarian historiography. Even though some diligently endeavored to combine Czech and Slovak histories (Václav Novotný, Václav Chaloupecký, Albert Pražák,³ and the Slovak politician Ivan Dérer⁴), their efforts were conceptually and ideologically limited and did not prove to be viable. Slovak history soon freed itself from the framework of Czechoslovak history.

On the political level, the autonomous Slovak historiography threw itself into the autonomist efforts of Hlinka's Slovak People's Party.⁵ The conception created by its court historian František Hrušovský⁶

persisted among anti-Communist circles in the post-war period and became the basis for the 'neo-Ľudák' (ethno-populist) version of Slovak history even after 1989.⁷ In 1942, the Academy of Sciences was founded, and Slovak historiography emerged as a central tool of the Slovak state, the ally of Nazi Germany. However, its officially supported output was more propaganda than scientific history. In the short time between the end of the war and the Communist coup d'état of 1948, František Bokes published his *History of Slovakia*.⁸ However, immediately after the Communist takeover the historiography was united and controlled within the strictly centralized Communist cultural policy. In the 1960s, the tendency to revise the Czecho-Slovak relationship in the framework of the 'people's republic' was again strong in Slovakia. Discussions appeared on the pages of the *Historický časopis* (Historical Journal), and a professor from the Department of Czecho-slovak History, Miloš Gosiorovský, from 1951 a leading Party cadre in the historical sciences at Comenius University, worked out a historical justification for the need to federalize the republic.⁹

In the foreword to the new edition of Lubomír Lipták's "Slovakia in the 20th Century", Ivan Kamenec wrote: "Perhaps the most important and most effective role was played by historiography (together with other social science disciplines) in establishing the new constitutional solution of the Slovak question in the Czechoslovak Republic. Here, historians had the greatest opportunity for 'social application' and intervention in public affairs."¹⁰ It is also clear from Kamenec's comment that a very different accent on individual historical moments and the role of historiography in them is still present in Czech and Slovak theoretical-methodological literature.¹¹

While the idea of a united Czechoslovak nation was quietly abandoned after the Second World War, different perceptions of individual historical moments continued to exist. One needs only to take into account the examples of Hussitism or the Battle of White Mountain. Whereas in the Czech lands the Hussite period was a source of national pride, in Slovakia it was marginal. The Battle of White Mountain of 1620, yet another historical landmark in Czech history, was in its anti-Catholic interpretation hardly acceptable in Slovakia. It was necessary to confront the concept of an independent Slovak history, emerging in its historiographical form during the 1930s, with the Czech concept, which had been developing for more than a century. From the begin-

ning of the Czechoslovak republic, Slovak and Czech historiography were unequal in their development.

The national conception of Slovak history was elaborated during the first two decades after WW I. It is characteristic that this happened not only in confrontation with Czech but also with Hungarian historiography. In the light of recent developments, this is obvious, but it was clearly underestimated in post-war "Czechoslovak historiography." This complex relationship is present in the synthetic works of Slovak history, evidently marked by Marxist historiography, presented in "The History of Slovakia" (volumes I and II from 1961 and 1968), the encyclopedic "Slovakia I—History" (from 1971) and the "History of Slovakia" (volumes I–IV from 1985–1990).

The troubles of Slovak historiography in the period between 1945 and 1989 were of both technical and ideological character. The technical difficulties included the inaccessibility of some domestic sources, especially those pertaining to the 20th century. At the same time, contact with Western historiography was almost impossible and access to foreign sources was limited. Especially in the period of Normalization (after 1968), travel to Western Europe was possible only for few selected and ideologically reliable persons. Historical production had its strict ideological rules. There was a state plan for scientific research, and only themes approved by the Communist Party could be researched. Until the end, the Czechoslovak Communist leadership made strict demands concerning the content of historical works, covering ideological terminology, themes, and the conclusions of research. Historians learnt to write between the lines, as it were, and their students learnt to read between these lines subsequently.

In this respect, there was a great difference between the situation in Czechoslovakia and that in Poland or Hungary. In Poland contact with the so-called 'Western science' was never broken, and if Czech or Slovak researchers wanted to learn about new trends in the social sciences, they often turned to Polish translations. In the 1980s, the Hungarian regime relaxed so much that, for example, sociologists could openly publish critical accounts about the social and political development of the country. Nothing like this existed in Czechoslovakia. An individual could find his/her own way to avoid open conflict with the regime and partially devote him/herself to his/her own interests, but an atmosphere of uncertainty and distrust prevailed.

Critical historical literature could only arise with difficulty in such a cramped environment. In the two decades before the fall of the regime, Czech and Slovak historiography was closed into itself. It was appropriate to devote attention to world history only to the end of the 19th century, as otherwise the author could only repeat the officially declared clichés. National history was the main focus, and in some areas it did achieve some depth. However, in methodology, historiography remained significantly behind West European development. Virtually only political history was written, and methodological questions were not reflected on at all. Small wonder that the “political history of the nation” still prevails in the output of Czech and Slovak historiography.

2. CHANGES AFTER 1989: INSTITUTIONS, RESEARCH VENUES, PUBLICATIONS

Alžbeta Sedliaková¹² regularly compiles a bibliographic review of Slovak historiographic writings, and many publications and articles have appeared on the state of Slovak historiography after 1989.¹³ As Dušan Kováč has noted: “If we speak of the origin of Slovak professional historiography, we must also realize that this origin actually occurred in three stages. The first milestone was 1919 with the foundation of Comenius University in Bratislava. The second beginning was in 1953 with the establishment of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which included the Institute of History. Unfortunately, this ‘new beginning’ was marked by the time—the Bolshevik regime and its ideology. For this very reason, Slovak historiography had its third beginning in 1989.”¹⁴ Penned by a leading Slovak historian with an important position in the Slovak Academy of Sciences, the statement confirms that professional historiography in Slovakia developed first after 1918 and its development was closely connected with institutional development.

Before 1989, historical work was concentrated in a handful of institutions. The two most important were the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Comenius University. The low number of institutions enabled the regime to easily control historical work and gave future historians little chance to develop even minimally independent views. Those historians who could not be employed in research institutions after 1968 because of their active involvement in the ‘reform-Communist’ movement but remained in the profession most frequently

worked in regional archives or libraries and were entirely prevented from publishing. The case of L'ubomír Lipták (1930–2003), who was rehabilitated only after 1989, is exemplary in this sense. His silencing for many years was a great loss for Slovak historiography. As Slovak historiography (as well as the Slovak intelligentsia as a whole) could not develop a flourishing samizdat culture, the situation changed only after the so-called 'Velvet Revolution'.

After 1989, the number of institutions concerned with history increased, mainly with the establishment of departments at newly founded universities. Currently, universities with historical departments are the following: The Faculty of Philosophy, the Faculty of Education, and the Faculty of Theology of Comenius University in Bratislava; the Faculty of Humanities of the College of Education in Nitra (since 1995 the University of Constantine the Philosopher); the Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Education of Trnava University; the Faculty of Philosophy of the University St. Cyril and Methodius at Trnava, the Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Education of Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica; the Faculty of Philosophy and Faculty of Education of Prešov University (recently merged into the Institute of History of the Faculty of Arts); the Faculty of Law of P. J. Šafárik University in Košice; and the Faculty of Arts of the Catholic University in Ružomberok.

Since the mid-1990s, the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences has operated a web site devoted to history. The site provides information about activities in the academic community, including the review *História*, *Historický časopis* and the Slovak Historical Society. It features reviews of publications and many useful links to other organizations.¹⁵ The historical community in Slovakia is headed by the Slovak National Committee of Historians. Formerly it was part of the Committee of Czech and Slovak Historians, but since 1993 it has been an independent member of the Comité International des Sciences Historiques (CISH). The Slovak Historical Society at the Slovak Academy of Sciences organizes regular conferences for its members. Four such conferences have been held since 1989 (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006).¹⁶ They were devoted mainly to the relationship of the historical sciences to politics. At the 2001 Smolenice conference Dušan Kováč spoke of the great inadequacies in the methodology of the historical sciences in Slovakia. These inadequacies among other things led to a low prepared-

ness for confrontation with traditional nationalism and the neo-Ľudák ideology and also hindered contact with fellow historians abroad.¹⁷

Apart from state institutions, non-governmental institutions also developed; however, their existence was complicated by formal difficulties in the early 1990s. Back then, the state attempted to intervene with their activities, and now they have to cope with an underfinanced educational system. The Academia Istropolitana was established in Bratislava in 1990. Due to state intervention the core of its staff left and founded the new Academia Istropolitana Nova in Svätý Jur.¹⁸ In 1997, the Forum Institute, a social science institute for the Hungarian minority in Slovakia, was established in Šamorín (Somorja), a few kilometres from the capital city. There are also working groups such as the Society for the History and Culture of Central and Eastern Europe¹⁹ headed by Tatiana Ivantyšynová, and the new interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence—a project of the Institute of Ethnology and the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava.²⁰ Cooperation with foreign colleagues exerts an important influence. It includes bilateral historical commissions (Slovak–Czech,²¹ –Hungarian, –German, –Polish, –Austrian, –Romanian and others), and participation in joint projects²² and programs.²³ World historical congresses are also a great impulse for Slovak historiography. Slovakia prepared a volume of papers for the one held in Oslo in 2000.²⁴ A conference on the theme of Slovak historiography lasting several days was held in Munich in October 2001, at the invitation of the Collegium Carolinum. It was probably the first such event abroad concerned exclusively with Slovakia. The papers presented in Munich appeared in the periodical *Bohemia* and in the Slovak *Historický časopis*.²⁵

Currently Slovakia has two popular historical magazines. The older of the two, which was initially welcomed by the historical community, is the *Historická revue*.²⁶ However, in the course of its development, its reputation declined because of a frequent lack of expertise on certain topics. Expertise and quality of information were sacrificed in the interest of popularization. It was originally published by the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport of the Slovak Republic, starting in 1990. Today it is published by a private publisher with the support of the Ministry of Education. For the more oriented public, the magazine *História*²⁷ was established in 2000. The Society Pro Historia publishes it under the patronage of the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

The specialist historical periodicals include the above-mentioned *Historický časopis* (Historical Journal),²⁸ published by the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, the annual publications of the Institute of History with the titles *Historické štúdie* (Historical Studies), *Studia historica slovacae*,²⁹ and *Z dejín vied a techniky na Slovensku* (From the History of Science and Technology in Slovakia), as well as *Slovanské štúdie* (Slavonic Studies). *Studia historica nitriensia*, an annual established in 1993, is published at the University of Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra.³⁰

As for publications, Ľubomír Lipták has repeatedly stressed that there were too many proceedings published in Slovakia.³¹ The problem, above all, is that volumes of papers are united in theme, but rarely reflect different methodological approaches. The level of individual contributions are often varied and the aim is merely achieving publication. A great many collections of papers have appeared in Slovakia since 1989, but not all of them give a very convincing impression. Most of them are publications of conference contributions.

The titles of the published collections of papers give a clear idea of the orientation of the academic historical conferences held in Slovakia during the 1990s.³² They reacted to a social demand and devoted themselves mainly to Czech–Slovak relations, to Slovakia's history during the Second World War, and later to the place of Slovakia from the perspective of the wider Central European region. In 1990, the Slovak Academy of Sciences began to organize conferences on individual periods of Slovak history³³ and sent Slovak historians to conferences in the Czech Republic.³⁴ Apart from the ongoing cooperation with Czech colleagues also the number of the collaborative projects with Austrian historians is increasing. Contact with Hungarians is unavoidable, but still strongly polarized due to the pertaining differences in interpretations of certain historical events and phenomena.

Several volumes of documents from the area of international relations have been published in Slovakia since 1989. The first contained documents concerning Slovak emigration up to the end of the Second World War,³⁵ the second included documentation of the contacts between the Slovak Republic and the Vatican³⁶ and the third consisted of documents on the relationship of France to Slovakia and Czechoslovakia.³⁷

As far as the Slovak history proper is concerned, documents were published from the period before the arrival of the Slavs to the Danube basin³⁸ and from the Slovak national revival,³⁹ as well as two series of documents devoted to the mapping and appreciation of Slovak national identity and statehood, as their titles already indicate.⁴⁰ For Czech-Slovak history,⁴¹ Slovakia has drawn on Czech publications⁴² to produce several collections of documents for use as university textbooks. Documents about the events of 1989 or the following years have been published recently.⁴³ Important documents have also been published in the biographical field. Documents on the relationship of the historian, linguist and promoter of independent Czechoslovakia R.W. Seton-Watson to the Czechs and Slovaks⁴⁴ as well as the speeches and texts of the symbolic figure of the Prague Spring, Alexander Dubček,⁴⁵ and the leader of Slovak state during the WWII, Jozef Tiso,⁴⁶ appeared. Two series of documents with different methodological underpinnings have come out on the history of the Jews in Slovakia. One was published by the Museum of Jewish Culture,⁴⁷ while the other began to be published in cooperation with the Milan Šimečka Foundation and the Jewish Religious Community.⁴⁸ In recent years, documents on the position of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia⁴⁹ and the legal position of minorities in general⁵⁰ have been published.

Independent encyclopedias devoted to Slovakia⁵¹ thrived after 1993. They played a popularizing role in relation to Slovak history. Encyclopedias of Slovak history in English and German were published in 2000.⁵² Several encyclopedias of Slovak historical and present-day personalities have also appeared.⁵³ A historical dictionary of the Slovak language⁵⁴ and a Slovak biographical dictionary have been published.⁵⁵ In related sciences, ethnography has been the most successful in producing encyclopedic works in Slovakia, with the publication of "The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia", the "Bibliographic Dictionary", and the "Encyclopedia of Folk Culture".⁵⁶ New volumes on the history of fine arts⁵⁷ and the history of theatre⁵⁸ have also appeared. Last but not least, a bibliography of Slovak history is published by the Slovak Academy of Sciences, namely by Alžbeta Sedliaková, once in every five years.⁵⁹ This author also publishes yearly reviews of historiography in *Historický časopis*.

3. THE TRANSITION AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

A new chapter in Slovak historiography opened with the year 1989. The turning point was clearly the fall of the Communist regime, which had severely limited historical work both thematically and ideologically. Above all, the need to re-evaluate national history grew after November 1989. However, according to Ivan Kamenec, there were actually two great re-evaluations: in 1989 and in 1993.⁶⁰ The year 1993 was an important turning point for Slovak historiography, since it began to devote its attention almost exclusively to Slovak history with all the difficulties the new situation brought about. However, the influence of 1993 in Slovak historical writing can be seen with one or two years delay. Ludák historical publications began to appear in large numbers at this time, the political situation sharpened, and Slovak historians had to react quickly to this shift to the nationalist right. In the second half of the 1990s, Slovak historiography increased its production by 67% compared to the first half of the decade, while historiography devoted to political history increased by 144% and publications devoted to the theme of the nation grew by 168%!

There was no historian who publicly opposed the need for critical reflection after 1989. However, various groups found different starting-points for this re-evaluation, and the results did not come immediately. It was not possible to put a new synthetic account on the market in the first five years, though partial studies and older works, which could not be published in the pre-November period, appeared.

Most historians halted their reinterpretations of Slovak history at 1948. As Pavol Petruf stated, an integrated picture of events after the Second World War had not appeared for quite a long time.⁶¹ Such a situation was natural, however, since the period of State Socialism personally concerns the majority of historians, and it is not easy to come to terms with it. The years after February 1948 are usually very closely intertwined with the personal memories and experiences of the historians themselves. The time-span since that period is too short for the social experience of the Communist era to be comprehensively and disinterestedly elaborated on. We still encounter in Slovak public life and politics people who actively participated in maintaining the regime. People who were seriously and often irreversibly harmed by the old regime are still alive. However, precisely because of them, professional

historians have an obligation to devote great attention to events of the recent past. Slovak historiography is only slowly taking this step.

Public intellectuals have taken the lead in the popularization of history. While the elite of Slovak historiography endeavored to produce specialized works, various authors indiscriminately produced a large number of simplified and misleading explanations, claims, and visions. The cause of this development are to be found in both: the excessively slow reaction of Slovak historians to the demands of the society and the rapidly swelling wave of nationalism, which made it difficult to adopt reasonable positions based on facts. Very often the non-professional accounts also attempted to take the place of works by experts. Anybody can participate in the production of works on history if the publisher accepts it. What is more, the two main universities and the Academy of Sciences are gradually losing their monopoly on the "production of young researchers." In order to retain their symbolic position of defining the historical discourse many researchers and academicians, especially from the social sciences, express their views on current problems on the pages of selected newspapers and magazines. Thus, the expert public is not isolated but rather is an integral part of Slovak society.

Apart from the need to rapidly satisfy the public, there was also a need to revise the literature used in teaching history. Almost immediately, in 1990, textbooks were published for the upper grades of elementary school and secondary schools.⁶² Further textbooks for elementary schools followed, in spite of some politically motivated delays.⁶³ Thanks to nationalist political interventions into the historical sciences, there were still no new history textbooks in grammar schools (*gymnasias*) even ten years after the change of political regime, in spite of all the publishing activity. As a result, students supplemented their reading with publications such as "The History of Slovakia" and "The Slovaks on the Road to Self-Awareness" by Anton Špiesz and "The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks" by Milan Ďurica.⁶⁴ The first of these books repeats old nationalist clichés about the thousand-year road of the Slovak nation to independence, and the second is the work of an exiled historian, who does not hide his sympathy for the Slovak wartime pro-Nazi regime. Moreover, the public protests have been aroused by the fact that the work of Milan Ďurica was approved and financed by the minister of education of the time.

In a way, the return of the post-war exiles was a great blow for Slovak historiography. As Dušan Kováč writes: "After November 1989 some historians returned from exile who had preserved their clearly ideological conception of Slovak history throughout those years. They were joined by some of their blood brothers in Slovakia, and all found shelter in *Matica Slovenská*."⁶⁵ For the most part, the exiles had solidly rightist views connected with the Ľudák tradition. They were mostly former active members of that movement, and they outlined a nationalist program. Ľudák historiography had a clear idea of how to interpret the history of Slovakia in the 20th century. This idea had already been established for a long time.⁶⁶ A large number of biographies and memoirs⁶⁷ expressing Ľudák views were published after 1989. They included works originally published abroad, often long before, and works produced in Slovakia, either from unpublished sources or written after 1989.⁶⁸ The memoirs are clearly concerned with the period of the independent Slovak state, while the biographical literature is exclusively devoted to the three leading personalities: Jozef Tiso,⁶⁹ Andrej Hlinka⁷⁰ and Alexander Mach.⁷¹

Ľudák historiography interprets Slovak history from a strongly nationalist point of view. The group, leading representatives of which are František Vnuk and Milan Ďurica, also found younger followers such as Robert Letz and Ján Bobák. As mentioned above, an extensive controversy arose around M. Ďurica's "The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks"⁷² in September 1996. The Ministry suggested Education to use this book as a reference text for the teaching of history in all elementary schools. It was also distributed to the schools for free. The Institute of History of the Academy officially denounced the book in March 1997 for its clear ideological bias.⁷³ The controversy was spread into the arena of domestic and, later, international politics. In July 1997, the Minister of Education had to withdraw the formerly approved book. Thus, fortunately, the nationalist textbook was not officially used in the Slovak Republic.

The Ľudák branch of Slovak historiography has ambitious explanatory goals regarding Slovak history. It is concerned with demonstrating that the Slovak nation originated more than a millennium ago and that its efforts to form a Slovak state reach back just as far. Such a conception obviously has resonance in present-day Slovak politics and

to a large extent arises from political demands of a part of the Slovak political spectrum.

It is necessary to remark, however, that Ľudák historiography is definitely in minority and isolation in the historical community. Nevertheless, the nationalist interpretation of Slovak history admittedly has a wide resonance in society and has found support especially among older people who remember the period of the war-time Slovak state. Also the Communist past of the country contributes to the persistence of the nationalist narrative, since all evaluations of the wartime Slovak regime as “totalitarian” or “fascist” are condemned as the result of Marxist deformation and/or unacceptable Czechoslovakism.

We do not claim that the Ľudák literature is the only kind of historical literature produced in Slovak exile circles. Such a claim would be an over-simplification. However, the writings of Slovaks living abroad have characteristics in common with the work of a large proportion of Central European exiles from different countries. Among emigrants and the descendents of emigrants concerned with the social sciences, one often finds the phenomenon of “paying the debt.” In such cases, the author feels a need to devote attention to his native country or the native country of his parents and in some way compensate for his absence. Until the *Concise History of Slovakia*, edited by Elena Mannová, appeared in 2000, Slovak history has been represented in the English-speaking world by the publications of Stanislav J. Kirschbaum and Peter Toma.⁷⁴ The former does not deny his engagement in post-1945 emigrant societies,⁷⁵ while the latter, trying to avoid ideologization, leaves out any unifying idea of Slovak history and restricts himself to factography. The first attitude is typical of Slovak exiles in general, not only of professional historians. Although they do not match the extreme nationalism of Milan Ďurica,⁷⁶ they strongly express attitudes of integrist nationalism and messianism, they are methodologically and thematically backward, and they show clear political and national bias.⁷⁷

It has been mentioned that the extreme rightist interpretation of history is isolated in the academic environment, although it has resonance in society, especially among the older generation. One of the reasons for this “success” of the Ľudák ideology is also an inadequate historical reflection. Slovakia did not have the opportunity to reflect on its own history from the period 1938–1945 the way in which West Germa-

ny or Austria have since the 1980s. In the post-war history of Czechoslovakia political factors permanently prevented such a reflection, and by now it has been successfully avoided for another 15 years. Despite all of this, reflection on wartime history must eventually take place.

The first two conferences of the Slovak Historical Society were devoted to the relationship between the historical sciences and politics. The question of whether historiography receives its tasks from outside or finds them within the boundaries of its own field was asked, but there was not sufficient reflection on the political failure of the historians in 1989 and their academic failure to confront the nationalist ideologies in the 1990s.

The interpretation of Slovak history is strongly tied to politics, whether as a storehouse of arguments or as an active component in the shaping of public opinion. In some stages after 1989, non-professional historians took over the production of history. At some moments, the political leaders themselves attempted to define it. In the political context of nationalism, a dispute arose over the Institute of History itself. There was a proposal to subordinate this part of the Slovak Academy of Sciences to Matica Slovenská. The rivalry between the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and the newly established Institute of Slovak History of Matica Slovenská was quite open. There could be no doubt about the consequences of such a step, and the fact that the dispute also appeared on the pages of periodicals such as *Bohemia* testifies to the seriousness of the situation. It was shocking that in 1996 the democratically elected government of Slovakia virtually attempted to liquidate the Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Another politically motivated dispute, which is still continuing in Slovak historiography, revolves around the writing of personal names. It started in the 1980s and is still alive today.⁷⁸ The debate originally started out from the conviction that names of foreign origin can be appropriately translated into Slovak, especially when there is a “historical justification” for this. However, the weakness of the whole project is precisely the obscurity of the bases for the justification of rewriting names in particular instances. It is difficult to definitively determine the nationality and, therefore, the appropriate writing in the case of the majority of aristocratic families that lived on the territory of Slovakia for centuries. The families themselves wrote their names differently

in different centuries, and the way of writing itself expressed their political and other aspirations. What some of their forefathers worked to achieve is now denied and revised by professional historians.

The whole dispute is based on a disagreement between historians who project the possible contemporary aspirations of the Slovak nation into the writing of history, and those who want to avoid this distortion. The revised forms of personal names are still used in the Slovak biographical dictionary, in which the family name "Nyáry" becomes "Náriovci," and "Csáky" becomes "Čákiovci."⁷⁹ However, some authors return to the original spelling. The examples include *The Concise History of Slovakia*, in which authors like Elena Mannová and Eva Kowalská show the results of dual writing in a quite practical manner. The dispute about the writing of personal names in expert works influences all editorial work in the academic historical profession.⁸⁰ However, since the history of the territory of the present-day Slovak state is the history of several overlapping ethnic groups (not just Hungarians and Slovaks), a definitive solution is not possible either for one historical epoch or for a specific geographical area. The writing of personal names is a matter of consensus, but in the end each author has to come to an individual decision about it. The use of the expression "Slovakia" has created a problem similar to that of writing personal names. It is not an ideal term for periods before 1918, and there are conventions by which the term "Slovakia" is replaced by longer and more awkward phrases such as "the territory of present-day Slovakia".

Many authors concerned with the history of Slovakia distinguish two currents in recent Slovak historiography: national or conservative and "cosmopolitan" or liberal. Representatives of the first support the primordialist idea of the organic development of the nation, Christian values, and the history of the Slovaks seen as a thousand-year road to state independence. Representatives of the second see the nation as a modern phenomenon. In practice, however, the difference is mainly in the extent to which thinking in national terms and national criteria characterizes each, since both these conceptual camps belong to the category of national historiography, which regards one nation with its cultural and political aspirations as the subject of its historical inquiry. Some individual authors are attempting to break away from this historiographic tradition, which has been in place in Slovakia for more than a century. However, as elsewhere in East-Central Europe, there

are only isolated instances of such works, and they still lack a broader acceptance and support.

In his article on recent Slovak historiography, Juraj Podoba⁸¹ unambiguously draws attention to the heritage of Communism in the academic world. There is a lack of critical thinking and critical discussion. Critically thinking and acting academicians are ostracized and marginalized. Let us add that the terms “critical thinking” and “criticism” in general are connected with the expression “constructive criticism,” misused under the old regime. The absence of a critical approach was and is connected with the absence of tolerance of different views and that of a plurality of perspectives, approaches, and methodologies. The loss of contact with West European science is still being felt today. After 1989, the Slovak historical guild faced the task of critical reflection on the preceding period and of becoming a full member of the world historical science community. We think that neither of these tasks has been completed up to now—which corresponds to the situation in other post-communist countries. Slovak historiography is still struggling with the heritage of the ideologically driven, paternalist state.

With allusion to the critical generational debate in the Czech Republic Roman Holec has noted on this: “We have no Martin Nodl,⁸² who would regularly exasperate us with his diction. I even have the feeling that we have no dissatisfied young historians, who could present the accounts and give our circles a good airing.”⁸³ Holec asks obliquely about where the young historians are who could call the previous generations to account. He gives the answer himself: “The lack of methodological grounding and complete absence of theoretical categories in our works does not trouble above all those who do not feel the need to or do not have the opportunity to confront works from foreign countries, where extraordinary importance is given to theoretical questions both at universities and in scientific education. It is the basis for the concept of the historical school, which is (in Slovakia) absurdly supplied by the number of doctoral students.” This reflects the policy of the universities towards young researchers, whose critical voices are concentrated on technical problems and lack of support from their older colleagues.

4. THEMES AND APPROACHES

In the 1990s new themes appeared and new areas of research were opened. They include Church history, Jewish history, the history of everyday life, or gender history. Slovak research is beginning to concentrate more on the questions of identity, collective memory, historical stereotypes, and myths; it uses new methodologies and is comparable to work in other countries in Central Europe. However, there has been no change of paradigm.⁸⁴ Political history remains in the first place, and all synthesizing works are the results of the victory of national historical narrative. 'Positivism' still prevails in methodology.

Dušan Kováč has been critical of national historiography: "Slovak history has long been perceived and taught in Slovakia as a more or less closed system, and the national or ethnic development of the Slovaks has been emphasized. This closed character was broken to some extent, but only in one direction—towards Czech history. (...) In any case, it is proven that the closed conception of Slovak history, according to which this history has meaning only in itself and for itself, is unsustainable. (...) Just as a nation as existing only for itself cannot have meaning, national history cannot have meaning without confrontation with a wider space, and for Slovakia this space is not only Central Europe."⁸⁵ Roman Holec claims that the methods of the historical sciences in Slovakia are a form of the "positivism of the 19th century denuded of any sign of theoretical considerations, not to speak of any new methods."⁸⁶ Significantly, both authors come from the highest rank of the Slovak academic community.

The "Selected Bibliography of Slovak History" by Alžbeta Sedliačková includes almost four thousand (3,938) separate publications and articles, devoted to Slovakia, Slovak history, or written by Slovak authors, in the period 1990–1999. Interestingly, there has been an increasing number of publications: while between 1990 and 1994 Sedliačková recorded almost 1,500 publications, in the following period almost 2,500. 78%, about 3000 works from the whole output is devoted to Slovak history and only 7% to non-Slovak history.⁸⁷ At the same time, there has been a decline in the proportion of works devoted to non-national history, from 7.9% between 1990 and 1994 to 6.7% between 1995 and 1999. Most of the works on general history are de-

voted to Russia, including the Soviet Union and Russia, or to Hungary, including the historic Kingdom of Hungary.

In historiography, Slovak history means the history of the 19th and 20th centuries, as 57% of Slovak history is devoted to this very period. It is even more interesting that a whole quarter of Slovak history is related to the period 1918–1945 (between 1990 and 1994 it is 24.5%; between 1995 and 1999—26%!). Economic history with 9% and local or regional history with 13% kept their position. 6% of works were devoted to national questions in the nineties, but only 5% to Church questions and less than 2% to Jewish history. Only a few works were devoted to the Romany community.

The thematic composition of the output is clearly one-sided. Almost 30% of the publications on Slovak history are devoted to political history, and we find a large increase in political history in the second half of the nineties compared to the first half. While in the first half it made up 22%, in the second half as much as 34%. Cultural history including science, culture and art was 22% in the nineties, with the largest part devoted to the Slovak language and Slavonic studies.

The history of the territory of present-day Slovakia up to the 9th century is called the “Pre-Hungarian period” in English. In Slovak, the expressions “Pre-Slavonic period” and “Slavonic period” are used for the same period. This part of Europe had its Celtic period, Roman and Germanic period, the Migration, the coming of the first Slavs, and the Great Moravian Empire. Therefore, the study of this period is very divided and based mainly on archaeological research. Two ambitious publications of sources on the “Pre-Hungarian” period⁸⁸ and works on the earliest history of some areas and localities⁸⁹ have been published since 1989. Gabriel Fusek devoted attention to the Slavonic period, Ján Steinhübel wrote about Great Moravia and the first kings of Hungary, and Vincent Sedlák considered the ethnogenesis of the Slovaks.⁹⁰ Until recently, the most important historian who devoted attention to early history was Alexander Avenárius. His area of interest extended from Byzantium to Church history up to the 12th century. His contributions to the methodology of historiography and the alternative histories of Slovakia were equally great.⁹¹

In the period up to the 9th century, we find one theme that became central in the 1990s. It is Great Moravia, its significance, and its relationship to present-day Slovakia. Does Great Moravia belong to Slovak

national history and is Slovakia the “heir” of Great Moravian Empire? These are the questions Slovak historiography was about to answer. Two large collections of texts on Great Moravia and the history of the territory of present-day Slovakia from the 6th to the 10th centuries were published in the 1990s.⁹²

Subsequently, the territory of present-day Slovakia was conquered by the Hungarians or Magyars and came under the scepter of the kings of Hungary. The history of Slovakia was essentially the history of the Upper Hungarian region in the Kingdom of Hungary. Slovak historians either devote their attention to Hungarian politics, as in three publications on the Árpád dynasty, the Angevin kings,⁹³ and the reign of Sigismund of Luxemburg⁹⁴ by groups of authors, as well as in the works of Blanka Brezováková and Július Bartl, or to regional history. An example of the latter is the work of Ferdinand Uličný, who emphasizes the development of the towns. From his point of view, the territory of present-day Slovakia was an urbanized and developed part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Apart from monographs on smaller Upper Hungarian towns, two extensive collections of texts on the histories of Bratislava and Košice were published.⁹⁵

The settlement of the territory of southern Slovakia before the 13th century has been a topic of heated debate. Was this territory settled before the coming of the Magyars? If so, by whom? Which ethnic group lived in the southern half of present-day Slovakia up to the end of the 12th century? In more recent works, authors like Branislav Varsik have attempted to give a definitive answer to this question, with the help of the analysis of regional names.⁹⁶

A shortage of sources is typical of the work of Slovak medievalists. The territory of today's Slovakia as one of the regions of the Kingdom of Hungary has its place in Hungarian publications such as Hungarian chronicles, but there has been inadequate publication of local sources in present-day Slovakia. The *Gesta Hungarorum* was edited by Vincent Múcska.⁹⁷ In the second half of the 1990s, Richard Marsina and Július Sopko published a collection of medieval legends and chronicles with the aim of approaching the image of Upper Hungary through the eyes of contemporaries. Both authors focused on cultural history. Apart from the medieval history of today's Slovakian territory from Great Moravia to the High Middle Ages, Richard Marsina also devotes attention to

methodology and the history of historiography. Ján Lukačka, Július Bartl, František Oslanský and others specialize in medieval social history.

After 1526, the Kingdom of Hungary became part of the Habsburg Empire, with half of its territory, including Buda, subsequently coming under Turkish rule. With this change, the territory of today's Slovakia became vitally important. The state administration and the Church authorities were transferred to the territory of Upper Hungary, and the Hungarian crown was kept in the Church of St. Martin in Pressburg (Pozsony, today Bratislava).

Upper Hungary bordered on the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish expansion directly affected it. Among recent historians, Vojtech Kopčan devoted attention to Turkish studies. The Reformation penetrated into present-day Slovakia from the 16th century and encountered the strong re-Catholicization policy of the Habsburgs. David P. Daniel works on the history of the Reformation in Slovakia. The work of Ján Tibenský concentrates mainly on the first half of the 18th century, while Eva Kowalská, Viliam Čičaj, Pavel Horváth, and Maria Kohútová are concerned with the Enlightenment and the influence of the French Revolution in Upper Hungary at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. Eva Kowalská deals mainly with education and the rise of the national movement. Viliam Čičaj concentrates on publishing. Pavel Horváth and Mária Kohútová are concerned with biographies as well as with social history. Works on economic history are scarce. A few articles have been written on the history of the Jews in today's Slovak territory in the medieval and early-modern periods,⁹⁸ while Vladimír Gecelovský and Pavol Šalamon published some texts on the history of the Romany.

Medieval and modern history provides sufficient biographical materials. Two publications on the lives of saints⁹⁹ and a large publication on scientific life in Bratislava¹⁰⁰ have appeared. Publication on the history of music in Slovakia is also continuing.¹⁰¹ The 19th century is the period of the 'National Revival'. With this, the development of the Slovak nation comes into the centre of attention. From the 19th century, cultural history is subordinate to the unifying idea of political emancipation. Predictably, the greatest part of Slovak historiography is devoted to political history. The most recent volume of the six-volume academic synthesis "The History of Slovakia" III, covering the period from 1848 to the end of the 19th century, was published in 1992.¹⁰²

The work was sponsored by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. However, most importantly, new versions of the history of Slovakia from the beginning to recent times have appeared. These include the works of the Ľudák exiles and other nationally oriented publications. Some of the Slovak Academy of Sciences' historians such as Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták have also produced their synthetic accounts. The works of Ľubomír Lipták and Pavol Petruš also appeared in translations, which is a great achievement with regard to greater variability of Slovak historical interpretations available in foreign languages. With some exaggeration one may say that almost every member of the Slovak historical community felt challenged, often in reaction to the rightist interpretation, to express his/her view on the "meaning of Slovak history."

From non-national history, works of well-known names appeared, with only a few covering a longer period or being a result of long-term research. Slavomír Michálek and Pavol Petruš produced significant works; Petruš also contributed to the history of historiography and published editions of sources. So-called "world" or "general" history is usually limited to international relations with regard to Slovakia. One of the latest important works is "Views to the East" mapping the attitudes towards Soviet Russia in Slovak politics between 1934–1944 by Dagmar Čierna-Lantayová.¹⁰³ In addition, a series of publications on military history appeared in the 1990s.¹⁰⁴

The growth of thematic literature on the years after the Second World War has been a significant feature of Slovak historiography since the second half of the nineties, which concerns again mostly Slovak history.¹⁰⁵ It is interesting that up to this day no historian has produced a thorough analysis of the independent Slovak state during the Second World War. There are some researchers who devote their attention to this very period—other than the Ľudák authors, especially Valerián Bystrický. Some issues about the Holocaust have been discussed in the course of the last 15 years, and some very important documents on that topic were published. However, the war-time Slovak state has still not been successfully and consistently situated in the history of Slovakia.

Biographical literature has undergone the same rapid progress as literature on Slovak history. In particular, biographies of Slovak personalities from the interwar period have appeared,¹⁰⁶ usually interpreted from different viewpoints. Apart from the leading figures of the Slovak

state already mentioned, the main heroes of these are Milan Rastislav Štefánik, one of the founding figures of the Czechoslovak republic, Milan Hodža, the leading democratic politician and political thinker of the interwar period as well as Prague Spring leader Alexander Dubček.¹⁰⁷ Generational biographical works and biographies related to other historical branches have also appeared. Roman Holec has written a series of unusual biographies that overlap with economic history, attempting to put historical personalities into a comprehensive social and cultural context.¹⁰⁸ Recent Slovak economic history strives to employ new methodological approaches. However, the majority of publications from this area are still produced in the spirit of neo-positivism with archival research forming the basis for detailed work with firm regional or period definitions, but often without wider theoretical anchorage. A close connection of the economic history of the medieval and modern periods with the history of aristocratic families in Slovakia is characteristic.

A group of authors, which includes Marián Tkáč, Rudolf Návrat and Ján Valach, has developed an unusual approach to economic history. They researched the lives of Slovak personalities who engaged in finance and banking, although they are primarily known from other areas. Among them are doctors of medicine, politicians, teachers and such prominent figures from Slovak history as Ľudovít Štúr, Pavol Országh Hviezdoslav, and Andrej Hlinka.¹⁰⁹ There are also works devoted to farming. These are not histories of great events; however, they do contribute to historical knowledge, in an area where it is not possible to use only written sources.

On the whole, social history, similarly to other areas of history, is marked by the preceding Communist period. In connection with this heritage and with the change in the political situation in 1993, it is necessary to deal with various ideological sediments. Traditional Slovak historiography explains the history of Slovakia on the basis of the development of one of its ethnic groups and concentrates mainly on political history. When attention was devoted to social history in the previous decades, the work had to exhibit rigid Marxist schemes. Slovak historiography differed in this respect from Polish and Hungarian, where social history, albeit not unrelated to Marxism, already reacted to international research trends from the beginning of the 1970s.¹¹⁰ Due to these tendencies, Slovak historiography was constrained by some stereotypes. In the center of Slovak history is the Slovak popula-

tion, the model of which is the simple Slovak, the peasant or the herdsman. The nobleman, that is, the lord, plays a negative role, to which his frequently different ethnic origin contributes. The urban middle class was often portrayed as anti-hero due to Marxist ideology.

A new approach to economic and demographic development and to social structure in the synthesis of Slovak history emerged only at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s.¹¹¹ The transition from political history to socio-cultural and socio-historical research is identifiable in regional history, but these cannot replace a more methodologically informed social history. As a matter of fact, only a few historians consider methodological questions.¹¹² Apart from his work on modernization, Ľubomír Lipták also dealt with the history of elites, identities, memories and stereotypes. Roman Holec has progressed from the study of economic history to research on social groups in the population, lifestyles, and the environment.

In research on everyday life, Slovak historiography devoted its attention to earlier periods. Concerning the 20th century, there is research partially originating in ethnology. In particular, Elena Mannová has published important findings on civil society and developed a multicultural and multi-ethnic approach. In recent years, the most interesting research on everyday life with an urban orientation has focused on the urban middle class in the 20th century (Elena Mannová), Bratislava (Peter Salner), and everyday urban life from the Middle Ages to the 19th century (Viliam Čičaj). Cooperation with foreign historians has been an important incentive in the area of social and cultural history.¹¹³ There is a series of articles by Slovak historians in the Hungarian periodical *Korall*.¹¹⁴ However, social history is still not institutionally established in Slovakia.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, a number of studies devoted to the family, sport, medicine have appeared, and a whole series on migration, which is again connected with the history of individual ethnic groups in Slovakia, has been published.

After 1989, it was possible to reopen the theme of Church history as a separate branch of historiography. Unlike in the Czech Republic, the Church is still an important factor in Slovak social life today, and interest in its history has grown rapidly.¹¹⁶ Apart from regional histories, the majority of works are devoted to the position of the Church before 1989 and so to the "history of oppression". Apparently, the time for reflection on the Church as an active power has not come yet. Never-

theless, the Evangelical College in Prešov has done important work in the field of Church history. Their publications appear in *Acta Collegii Evangelici Presoviensis*, a series under the management of the Bishop's Office in Prešov. They publish material on Church activities, volumes of collected historical works and editions of sources. Ján Šimulčík deserves special mention as a person who has devoted his attention to the history of the Catholic Church in the second half of the 20th century.

Last but not least, in the area of intellectual history, Vladimír Bakoš produced "Chapters from the History of Slovak Thought", part of which has also been published in English. Tibor Pichler wrote a path-breaking overview devoted to the political ideas of the 19th century, and Ján Mlynárik has published extensively on Czech professors and their Slovak pupils.¹¹⁷

5. THE PLURALITY OF VOICES: HISTORICAL REGIONS AND NATIONALITIES

Regional history was more or less on the margins in Slovak historiography during the 20th century. It received less publicity, procured insufficient resources for its development, and was generally regarded as a supplement to "greater history". Peter Švorc thinks¹¹⁸ that this was a reaction to the handicap of the Slovak nation, the territory of which was placed in a regional position for a long time. Švorc suggests, this situation has not changed since the 19th century. In our view, precisely the reverse is true. Slovak historiography had the task of constructing a Slovak national history comparable to the national histories of other European countries. It was under pressure from the European trend of the time in historiography and from social demands in Slovakia. Since every national history is ideological and ideology needs to be built from above, Slovak historiography first devoted itself to creating a corpus of national history. It did not devote attention to regional history because it did not have sufficient capacity and not because it would sadly recall the regional position of Slovakia in larger state units.

The attention of historians has now returned to regional and local history. The reason is that regional history and local history are relatively unexplored territories, becoming more and more popular and receiving regional financial support. The fact that it is possible to write and publish just about anything as long as somebody will pay for it

plays an important role—and there is no shortage of regional patriots in Slovakia.

Slovakia has three large regions, West Slovakia, Central Slovakia, and East Slovakia. In practice, usually only two regions, Central-Western Slovakia and East Slovakia, are distinguished. Apart from this, Slovakia is divided into historical administrative units, especially former counties, which gained specific characters thanks to their geographical and historical features. Slovakia did not develop as a united constitutional and administrative unit until 1918, and, therefore, its individual regions have different historical heritages. Of more than 3000 publications on Slovak history in the 1990s, 13.2% of the whole production were devoted to regional history.

The specificity of individual regions manifests itself in their economic development, their religious and ethnic development, and generally in their “contribution” to the history of Slovakia. There are regions which are difficult to fit into Slovak national history because of their mixed populations,¹¹⁹ but they have important positions in some of the histories of minorities in Slovakia. Regional history finds support among the various minorities. The supporters of regional history also include universities, especially the more recent ones established to accommodate historical differences among regions. The Church also plays a similar role. It strongly supports regional research and production of knowledge in connection with its regional institutions. The theme of support for regional history, which is also ideologically conditioned, takes us back to Church history and the history of national or ethno-religious minorities, which strongly overlap with regional history in Slovakia.

Although the volume of regional history has been increasing in Slovakia since the nineties, such history often takes the form of local history in the sense of the history of towns or villages rather than the history of territorial units. This is a result of the above-mentioned renaissance of regional patriotism. Methodologically, Ján Tibenský's homage to the Village of Budmerice has been a great step forward in regional history.¹²⁰

Slovak history is marked by religious division, multi-culturalism and multi-ethnicity. Of the three, the strongest characteristic is multi-ethnicity. The history of the non-Slovak communities constitutes a special chapter in the history of Slovakia. The topic cannot be treated by regional history in the cases of the Hungarians, the Germans, and the

Rusyns or Ukrainians. Church history cannot provide a framework for writing the history of the Jews, nor, to some extent, that of the Ukrainians and Rusyns. While histories of all the named ethnic groups in Slovakia often overlap with regional and Church history, the role of the present-day minorities in the history of Slovakia was and still is much more comprehensive.

Before 1989, only the Hungarians and the Ukrainians were recognized as ethnic minorities in Slovakia. Some works were devoted to them, but they were ideologically deformed. The Romany and the Rusyns did not exist in historiography, and very little space was devoted to the Germans and the Jews. Each of these ethnic groups has a different place in the history of Slovakia, assigned by history, changes of position in 1918 or 1945, and other factors. Up to 1918, assuming the history of Slovakia is not defined as the history of one ethnic group, historiography can start from some more or less uncontroversial facts. The administration of the territory of Slovakia was Hungarian, some areas such as Spiš were German, with the Germans excelling in mining and commerce as well as penetrating into the administration. The Jews after centuries of distress gradually achieved emancipation and devoted themselves to commerce. The Rusyns or Ukrainians and the Romany were practically ignored when the situation did not demand otherwise and they did not draw attention to themselves. By comparison, the Slovak population experienced a process of national emancipation from the end of the 18th century, but in reality it remained in a subordinate position.

From the beginning of the 19th century, the membership of individual ethnic groups and emerging nations began to play an important role in society. The 20th century brought an absolute change in the social positions of all the ethnic groups and a change in the way they reflected on their positions. The Hungarians lost their privileged status and began to be perceived as aliens in the new nation-state. The Jews were almost completely exterminated in Slovakia during the Second World War, and contemporary historiography is attempting to document this crime. The Germans in Slovakia were identified with those responsible for the war and were readily forgotten after expelling the "guilty" minority to Germany. The situation of the Rusyns or Ukrainians and the Romany could only improve in the 20th century. The Rusyn-Ukrainians had already attracted attention in the First Czecho-

slovak Republic with an attempt at autonomy. They began to reappear in the historiography of the 1980s. The Romany started to secure interest to historiography only in the 1990s, and their historical self-reflection has not yet been born.

Each of these ethnic groups has its own specificity and their only unifying element is their common history in the territory of present-day Slovakia. However, the histories of these ethnic groups transcend the borders of Slovakia. The histories of the Jews and the Holocaust, the Hungarians, and the Romany all take place in Central European or European contexts. The history of the Jewish community is a good example of the complicated situation of Slovak historiography. Working on the Holocaust, Slovak historiography must go beyond both Central European and European histories. At the same time, the history of the Jewish community is a perfect example of regional and local history as well as of "affliction by history." Little is known about the fate of the Jews in southern Slovakia and around Košice, since these territories were under Hungarian rule during the Second World War. This makes the work of Slovak historiographers even more difficult.

The history of the Germans in Slovakia has significantly developed since the 1990s.¹²¹ The Museum of the Culture of the Carpathian Germans¹²² was established in 1997 as an independent part of the Slovak National Museum. It produces the series *Acta Carpatho-Germanica* as well as other publications. In 2000–2002, the Institute of Social Sciences in Košice, under the leadership of Soňa Gabzdilová, researched the German minority in Slovakia after 1918. The focus of this research was on changes in the historical memory of Germans.

Up to 1918, the territory of present-day Slovakia was administered in Hungarian, and since then Slovak historiography has continually had to reckon with the Hungarian language and heritage. Before 1989, the Hungarians or Magyars were one of the two officially recognized nationalities in Slovakia, but not much was published about them. Since 1989, interest in the nationality theme has increased¹²³ and has found its sources of finance. The Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, under the leadership of Štefan Šutaj in Košice, concentrates on questions of identity, especially of the Rusyn-Ukrainian and the Hungarian minorities.¹²⁴ Since the end of the 1990s, the German minority in Spiš, and the Romany are also included in the themes researched. The Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of

Sciences has organized and participated in several projects and conferences on Slovak–Hungarian relations, and volumes of papers from these have been published. Among historians from Slovakia who have devoted attention to the Hungarian minority are Katalin Vadkerty and Daniela Čierna-Lantayová. A historian from abroad who addresses the theme of Hungarians as a minority in Slovakia is László Szarka. While some of the authors mentioned above managed to publish valuable scholarly contributes, in most texts dealing with the nationality question it is possible to identify an allegiance to one side or the other on the majority–minority issue; some take an openly confrontational approach.

Slovakia has a number of historians whose mother tongue is Hungarian; often, this motivates them to work on topics closely connected with the national question. In a period when nation-state centered history still prevails, it is impossible to be a Hungarian and a Slovak historian at the same time. Nevertheless, these historians are an integral part of the Slovak historical community. The Hungarian minority historians publish in both languages, and they connect with Hungarian historiography. Their interpretations of history do not resound in the Slovak environment and often is in temptation to become more controversial than that of historians from Hungary proper. In such a situation, the question remains whether Slovak and (Slovakian-) Hungarian historiography can be brought closer on common themes.

The Hungarian minority is building its own smaller institutions, some of them of an academic nature. The most prestigious Hungarian academic institution in Slovakia is the Forum Institute,¹²⁵ which holds historical conferences, produces publications, and summons part of the Hungarian intellectual community in Slovakia. The Forum was founded in 1996 at Dunajská Streda (Dunaszerdahely). In 2002 it moved to Šamorín (Somorja), near Bratislava. In this period, it divided into three institutions: the Forum Institute for Research on Minorities, the Forum Information Centre, and the Forum Centre for Regional Development. The *Biblioteca Hungarica* of Hungarian-language literature from Czecho-Slovakian provenance, assembled on civil initiatives since 1990, became part of this institution in 1997.¹²⁶ A large proportion of the published works concentrate on the ethnography of Hungarian settlement in the territory of present-day Slovakia and the social history of ethnically mixed territories. This was necessitated by the shortage of

such works in the preceding period and made possible by the fact that ethnography and ethnology are definitely less involved in Slovak political discussions in a confrontational way than historiography. Lately, Komárno (Komárom) has also become an important center for the Hungarian intelligentsia in Slovakia. This is partly given by tradition and partly by the new situation, in which Komárno has become the location for a Hungarian-language university. An increasing number of historical writings in Hungarian is also published here.

In addition to those mentioned, books are brought out in Slovak and Hungarian by various Slovak publishers; it is also possible to find bilingual publications. The publishing house *Kalligram* releases a large number of translations from Hungarian and basic, now already classical, literature on the nationality question in the Central European region during the course of the 20th century.

Much space has been devoted to the history and position of the Jews in the territory of Slovakia during the post-revolutionary years. One reason is that the Jewish community flourished after 1989 compared to the preceding period. The theme of the history of the Jews was again opened to the public, and the wartime Slovak state was at least partly dealt with in connection with this topic. The authors who have done most work in this area are Eduard Nižňanský and Katarína Hradská among historians and Peter Salner in ethnology and cultural anthropology, all from the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Peter Salner is also the head of the local Jewish community. Their works are significant resources to those with an interest in Jewish themes; but we find texts by many other authors as well. A whole series is devoted to regional and local histories of Jewish communities throughout Slovakia.¹²⁷

A new institution addressing Jewish history has been founded. The Institute of Jewish Studies at Comenius University in Bratislava, established in the nineties, has no parallel, for example, in the Czech Republic. Some experts on Jewish studies from the Czech Republic participated in its establishment. The Institute has already published several volumes of papers, which are interesting for their wide methodological range, covering history, cultural studies, philosophy, and ethnology.¹²⁸ The Milan Šimečka Foundation¹²⁹ now includes a Holocaust documentation center and a section of the Slovak National Museum, the Museum of Jewish Culture publishes the series *Judaica Slovaca* and the annual *Acta Judaica Slovaca*.

The fate of the Jewish communities in Slovakia is drawing much attention. The first wave of literature on this theme concerned the "history of persecution", examined from the perspectives of the majority and the minority communities. The Second World War and the Holocaust were the main themes in this period. After 1989 some fundamental works that had been written but could not be published earlier appeared. They included above all the book by Ivan Kamenec.¹³⁰ Collections of documents also came out: Eduard Nižňanský and Katarína Hradská have done important work in this area.¹³¹ Besides older memoirs, new ones were also put out after 1989.

Since the end of the 1990s publications opening a new approach to the history of the Jews in Slovakia have begun to appear. These address the social composition of the Slovak community and the place of the Jews in it. New methodological approaches are also developing in this field. In the nineties, the book by Peter Salner "They Survived the Holocaust" was published as a result of an extensive research project.¹³² Using the method of oral history, it preserves the stories of 150 victims of the Holocaust. In 2000, Peter Salner published the book "Jews between Tradition and Assimilation",¹³³ in which he attempted to capture the changes experienced by the Jewish community in the course of the 19th and the 20th centuries. The book is concerned with questions of identity, assimilation and the relationship between the minority and majority populations. The ethnologist Eva Krekovičová is also concerned with the Jews in Slovakia. She has focused on the image of the Jew in Slovak folklore.

The development of the Romany theme in Slovakia is remarkable. According to official figures, the percentage of the Romany in the population of Slovakia is relatively small, however, on the basis of demographic estimates and sociological research, the minority has about 320,000 members among more than five million of Slovak citizens. Therefore, the history of the Romany, if only the history of their relations with official culture and administration, is an important issue for Slovakia. Some works on this theme have appeared. These works are monographs, as this minority still does not appear in syntheses. An exhibition with the title "Historical Milestones for Slovakia in the 20th Century" opened in Bratislava Castle in January 2003. Although it gave details of the military history and the revolutionary and ethnic map of Slovakia up to the beginning of the century, it included not one

word about the Romany Holocaust. The *Concise History of Slovakia*¹³⁴ is an exception among the synthetic works in which as a rule the Romany are not included.

Arne Mann devotes especially much attention to the Romany problem in Slovakia. It is clear that all work on this theme deals with relations between the state and the Romany or the society and the Romany. Apart from historians, the Institute for Public Questions lead by Grigorij Mesežnikov¹³⁵ (Michal Vašečka is the director of its programme on nationality questions) and the Milan Šimečka Foundation¹³⁶ devote special attention to the Romany. However, these institutions are mainly concerned with sociological research or work for the social integration of the Romany. In 2001–2003, two research projects were carried out by the Institute of Social Sciences in Košice under the leadership of Anna Jurová, on the “Development and Position of the Romany in Slovakia since the Enlightenment Reforms” and “The Romany in Slovakia after 1945.” Research on the Romany is done in the framework of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The number of historians addressing the theme is still insufficient. Thus, Slovakia has to draw on Czech writings on the Romany.

Literature on the Rusyns or Ukrainians greatly increased in Slovakia in the 1990s. Apart from articles, whole monographs appeared on the fate of this group as well as on the history of Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia (Podkarpatská Rus).¹³⁷ The methodology of engaged historiography is illustrated by the Rusyn example. In the case of the history of individual nationalities in Slovakia, there is always a researcher or a group to devote attention to the problem with full enthusiasm. This is the case with the circle of the US-based historian Paul Robert Magocsi, which produces a great number of works on the Rusyns. The Department of History of the Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences of Prešov University (Peter Švorc) is also interested in the Rusyns' past. The Institute of Social Sciences in Košice has researched the Rusyns in Slovakia and the Slovaks in Ukraine under the leadership of Marián Gajdoš.

The history of the Czechs in Slovakia is not long, as they arrived only after 1918. In the context of the ideology of the one Czechoslovak nation, the attention of historians was not directed towards them. Even after the rejection of the Czechoslovak national ideal, the theme of Czechs in Slovakia was unwelcome. It was established as a legitimate

topic only after 1993, when the Czechs definitively became foreigners in the Slovak state. Part of the work on the Czechs in Slovakia is devoted to the period of the First Republic. The Slovak National Museum has published an extensive collection of texts on the Czechs,¹³⁸ and six parts of "A Small History of Czecho-Slovak Relations" have appeared.¹³⁹ The latter uses the method of oral history to map the common Czech and Slovak history from 1918 to the present. Dušan Kováč has published a monograph on the same theme and the "Czecho-Slovak Historical Yearbook" of 2000 provides a series of texts on mutual relations.¹⁴⁰

Slovakia provides interesting material for any research on ethnicity or the nation, and the terms 'multi-ethnicity' and 'multi-culturalism' have appeared in the works of some authors. However, the belief that the individual nationalities in Slovakia could smoothly coexist may appear idealistic. Therefore, the idea of "hybridity," introduced to Slovakia by Elena Mannová, is significant. Where should the history of the individual nationalities in the territory of Slovakia be placed in the discipline? It is difficult to subsume it under regional history, since it goes beyond the range of that. However, the history of the nationalities in Slovakia cannot be understood separately from its wide historical consequences. The history of the Hungarians in Slovakia is a category that makes sense only after 1918, since before that we can only speak of the history of the Slovaks in the Kingdom of Hungary. Therefore, when addressing these issues, a broader view needs to be taken of Slovak history.

Some of the researchers open to new themes in Slovakia began to devote their attention to the problems of identity and historical memory. They apply theories of ethnicity, nationalism, and strategies of remembering to the case of Slovakia.¹⁴¹ Štefan Šutaj and Viera Bačová of the Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Košice play an important role in this work. Among the ethnologists, it is possible to distinguish between those who persist with traditional ethnography and those who, making use of the political change, have devoted their attention to social and cultural anthropology and opened the question of ethnicity and collective identities from this point of view.¹⁴² The Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, headed by Gabriela Kiliánová, is the center of this work.¹⁴³ Folklore studies is another strong inspiration for research

on identities, stereotypes, and myths. This is the starting-point of Eva Krekovičová's work as well.

Generally, the theme of national identity and the politics of memory (*Erinnerungspolitik*) stirs all divisions of the Slovak historical community. It attracts the attention of the historians who are concerned in one way or another with the question of Slovak national ideology and national identity. The range of authors who work in this area is broad: those associated with Matica Slovenská, the above-mentioned exile historians and non-professional historians (mentioned here because of their influence and activity with regard to the Slovak public), as well as historians with traditional approaches and the historians concerned with social history and associated with the Slovak Academy of Sciences, such as Elena Mannová (collective identities), Eva Kowalská, Peter Macho, Dušan Škvárna (national identities), and Roman Holec.

6. HISTORIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH

A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia by Elena Mannová and David P. Daniel is a good introduction to the history of Slovak historiography.¹⁴⁴ Some extensive collections of texts on the same theme have appeared as well. Ľubomír Lipták, Richard Marsina, Elena Mannová, Ivan Kamenec, Eduard Nižňanský, Alexander Avenárius and others have addressed the methodology of historiography. However, the theory of historiography is usually closely connected with the problems of Slovak history. Purely methodological works are rare. When not concerned with reflection on the development after 1989, the history of historiography is usually interested in the inter-war period and the period of Marxism.

The Slovak historical community is relatively small, with only several hundred members.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, contact with foreign, including Czech, historiography concerned with Slovakia is very important, and some individual publications from abroad have great influence.¹⁴⁶ It is necessary to mention the work of two non-Slovak authors in regard to this: Elizabeth Bakke's book on Czechoslovakism and the Slovak autonomist reaction, and Ismo Nurmi's work, according to which Slovak national consciousness dates back to 1918. Both authors came to similar conclusions, and it is no accident that their criticism of traditional Slovak historiography comes from countries which solved the problem of national identity only in the 20th century.

Articles and whole books devoted to foreign historiography about Slovakia have appeared since the nineties.¹⁴⁷ Slovak historians are working on joint projects with historians from abroad who are interested in Slovak history: Peter Haslinger and Emilia Hrabovec in Austria, or László Szarka in Hungary. Such projects yield publications in English or German.

No historians in the Czech Republic write much about Slovak history. However, Slovak historiography draws on the Czech historiographic production and on the Czech archival sources. This tapping of Czech resources concerns the literature on the history of Czechoslovakia, publications of sources on the history of the common state, and not least of all translations of methodological or other historiographical literature. Some Slovak historical writings are published in the Czech Republic in mixed Czech–Slovak collections of papers. For some themes there are basic works in both languages that are impossible to ignore. If we compare the bilateral cooperation of Slovak historiography with its neighbors, we can clearly state that Slovak–Czech cooperation is remarkably productive. Joint conferences are held, collections of papers are put out, and two new syntheses of Slovak–Czech relations¹⁴⁸ and a collection of papers on the history of historiography have been published. Slovak bookshops offer a large amount of literature in the Czech language. But this Czecho-Slovak contact is unfortunately asymmetrical. Slovak production is of interest only to those Czechs who devote their attention to the history of the Czechoslovak state. In other themes, this interest depends on personal contacts between individual researchers in areas such as cultural history or methodology.

In the Czech lands, only a small group of people are concerned with Slovak rather than with Czechoslovak history; but it is a good sign that there are young researchers among them. Jan Rychlík became the pioneer of Slovak history in the Czech academia after 1989, and his work has had great success in Slovakia. Czech–Slovak cooperation has its difficulties, but for the obvious reasons that Czechs and Slovaks spent three-quarters of a century in a common state and that they are linguistically and culturally close, it will continue.

The majority of international conferences in Slovakia are attended mainly by historians from the Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary, Poland, and Ukraine. With its penetration into the history of Hungary, Poland, and Ukraine, Slovak historiography is significantly different from

its Czech counterpart. Czech, Austrian, Hungarian, Polish and Ukrainian historiography is regularly reviewed. Although each of them attracts the attention of only a few Slovak authors who speak the languages, they do continuously inform the whole Slovak historical community. The Slovak historians permanently monitor neighboring historiographies and have lively contacts with the authors, whether for their own reasons, or because of the needs of historical-geographical relations. This does not mean that they cannot have nationalistic attitudes, but such contacts will always be a great challenge and incitement for them.

What has been said about outreach and openness towards other national historiographies can be demonstrated at the levels of interest, of people, and of institutions. The level of traditional interests is determined by history and geography—or, shortly, by history. For many years, Slovakia was in common state formations with all its present neighbors: for 1000 years with the Hungarians, for a little shorter period with the Trans-Carpathian region, for almost 400 years with Austria, about 100 years with Galicia and three-quarters of a century with the Czechs. Slovakia is a small state in the heart of Europe, not only surrounded by its neighbors, but related to them through its citizens and historians. Thus, the historical-geographical merges with the personal. For every historical period, Slovakia has a historian who will be interested in the history of the Rusyns or Ukrainians, the history of the Slovakian Germans, Austrian history or the history of Orava and Spiš, where the histories of the Slovak and Polish ethnic groups overlap. There are always historians who devote attention to the history of the Kingdom of Hungary, the Hungarian Republic, or the ethnic Hungarians in the territory of Slovakia. The shoulders of these historians bear the weight of building the institutional contacts, which can create traditions, and there is much opportunity for this in Slovakia.

The main object of Slovak historiography, “Slovak history,” is a problematic concept because of its vagueness: language groups, state territories or units, and national cultures overlap. The reaction is to build syntheses on the basis of a territorial or ethnic approach. Slovak history is the history of the territory of present-day Slovakia or the history of the Slovaks. The former, purely geographical approach appears not to be ideologically objectionable, but it offers a very vague picture about Slovak history. The purely ethnic approach, categorizing according to ethnic origin, makes Slovak history the history of the Slovak eth-

nic group. The present synthesis of Slovak history is built on a combination of both approaches. The alternative to this approach is, for example, *The Concise History of Slovakia*,¹⁴⁹ the authors of which start from an understanding of the national phenomenon as a construction, which cannot be applied to earlier history. Slovak society is defined as multi-ethnic or socially and culturally fragmented.

In practice, Slovak authors have to solve two problems: the problem of a deficient state tradition and the ethnic problem or national discontinuity. Although this position may appear disadvantageous, it is actually an advantage, since every Slovak historian needs to build a new conception of history. While the experimentally thinking Czech, Hungarian, or Polish historian still gets stuck in the snares of national history, the Slovak historian, so to speak, has nowhere to get stuck. The concept of society as open to other societies, the history of which is studied by historians, could be for Slovakia, the way out of the ghetto of nation-state centered history. Needless to say, the conception of regions and the conception of trans-territoriality are relevant here.

7. CONCLUSIONS

What makes Slovak historiography interesting is not the quantity of its production, since like the historiography of many smaller states, it cannot compete with its neighbors in quantity. Its quality is dependent on a few significant personalities and their teams. However, what is specific is the route which Slovak historiography had to travel in the last 90 years and the situation it is in now.

Throughout the period of existence of the Czechoslovak state we can speak of the existence of "Slovak historiography," perceiving the inter-war period as its cradle. Professional Slovak historiography was born only after 1918 in the new Czechoslovak state. It gained institutional anchoring at that time and could educate the first generation of professional Slovak historians. From the beginning it was clear that the history of the Czech lands and Slovakia, like the political aspirations of the two nations, have less in common, than was at the given moment necessary to achieve ideological merging. The two nations identified themselves differently, although convinced Czechoslovakists existed, and so they created different national histories. In syntheses on the history of Slovakia, starting from the sixties to eighties, a conception of

“Slovak history” gradually became defined as the history of Slovakia and the Slovaks on the basis of a territorial-ethnic approach. In spite of this, for example, Richard Marsina argues that Slovak historiography had to give up its specificity because “Slovak history” as an academic discipline did not exist until 1989. After 1989 it allegedly had to free itself from the Czechoslovak context. (As was already stated, there was nothing to be freed of.)

The year 1989 and perhaps even more the year 1993 was an important milestone in Slovak historiography. The emergence of an independent Slovak state and the political conditions of the time gave voice to nationalists, who used history as one of the instruments in their argumentation. Therefore, the Slovak historical community turned to the theme of national history to provide an alternative to extremism and to keep pace with the interests of its readers. This turn appeared in the historiography of the second half of the nineties.

After the opening of Slovak historiography ensuing the long period of normalization, the return of the Slovak exiles was the catalyst of nationalism. However, apart from straight-forward nationalism, we find many signs of exaggerated emphasis on the national theme in indigenous Slovak historiography too. Apart from the nationalist parties and exiles, some of the intellectuals and historians also participated and are participating in the revitalization of national emotions and increased nationalism as an ideology in political and everyday practice. They still see their role as the interpretation of national history and strengthening of national identity. A certain frustration with the inadequate emphasis on the Slovak national theme before 1989 may play a role in this, as well as the heritage of the authoritarian state—conformism and the allegiance of historians to the political establishment.

The interpretation of Slovak history is strongly connected with politics, whether as a storehouse of arguments or as an active component in the creation of public opinion. The extreme rightist interpretation of history is isolated in the academic environment, but it has resonance in society, especially among the older generation. The reason for this “success” of the Ľudák ideology was and is the inadequacy of historical reflection. The years from 1938 to 1945 have not been subject to Slovak historical self-reflection. However, sooner or later self-reflection on wartime history will be very necessary.

A large part of the Slovak historical community shows passivity in face of the political directives, recalling the periods of direction by an ideological, paternalist state. Historiography in Slovakia is faced with practical problems such as the functioning of institutions, legislation, and the possibility of finding non-state resources to support research. The dominance of political history, thematic and chronological fragmentation, and a predominance of interpretation over deeper analysis, leading to manipulation of history, is characteristic of recent Slovak historiography.

All in all, Slovak historiography is not at a turning point. In the course of the next few years, the generations, which spent the greater part of their lives in the socialist normalization of Czechoslovakia, will finally leave, and space will open for today's young researchers and doctoral students. They had the opportunity, on their study visits, to deal with their own nationalism and learn about new methodological currents in the subject. Some of them will use these opportunities, for others it will be "only once." The greatest problem of these young researchers, who have the ambition to place Slovak historiography in the European mainstream, is to gain a place for their future academic work. Their colleagues from the natural sciences are leaving Slovakia for foreign countries. The question is, where will the social scientists apply themselves?

Significantly, Slovakian historiography benefits from contact with Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Ukraine. It also 'benefits' from contact with the Hungarian minority in Slovakia. It lives in a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural world. On the whole, this is its great opportunity.

NOTES

- 1 The author would like to thank Marína Zavacká (Institute of Historical Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava) and Slávka Otčenášová (Prešov) for their valuable comments and bibliographical advice.
- 2 For more details see Rychlík, "České, slovenské a československé dějiny—vztahy a souvislosti," especially 163–164.
- 3 Novotný, *Z dějin československých*; Pražák, *Češi a Slováci. Literárně dějepisné poznámky k československému poměru*; idem, *Československý národ*.
- 4 Déer, *Československá otázka*.

- 5 *Hlinkova Slovenská ľudová strana* - HSLS (Hlinka's Slovak People's Party; colloquially referred to as *ľudáks*): the main representatives of the autonomist efforts on the Slovak political scene of the inter-war period.
- 6 Hrušovský, *Slovenské dejiny*. The fact that the book was published in Martin is no accident. From the origin of Matica Slovenská in 1863, Turčiansky Svätý Martin was regarded as a sort of the centre of the Slovak national emancipation efforts.
- 7 For further information on Ľudák historiography see: Rychlík, *První československá republika v slovenské ľudácké a neoludácké historiografii*, 73–87.
- 8 Bokes, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias až po prítomnosť*.
- 9 Sent to the Party in 1963, fully published in *Historický časopis*, XVI., 3, 1968, 355–406. The existence of the material was well known to all students of history in Slovakia.
- 10 Lipták, *Slovensko v 20. storočí*, 366.
- 11 For more details see Lubomír Lipták's and Jan Rychlík's contributions in *Československo 1918–1938*.
- 12 Sedliaková, *Historiografia na Slovensku 1990–1994. Výberová bibliografia*; idem, *Slovenská historiografia 1995–1999. Výberová bibliografia*, idem, "Slovenská historiografia 2000. Výberová bibliografia," idem, "Slovenská historiografia 2001. Výberová bibliografia".
- 13 The whole number of *Bohemia* 42, 2001 and *Historický časopis* 52, 2, 2004 are dedicated to Slovak historiography. See also Mannová and Daniel (ed.), *A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia*; Winkler, "Alte Bilder und Neue Perspektiven: Aktuelle Arbeiten zur slowakischen Geschichte"; Petruš, "Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990–1994"; Kováč, "Die slowakische Historiographie nach 1989. Aktiva, Probleme, Perspektiven"; idem, "Paradoxa und Dilemmata der postkommunistischen Geschichtsschreibung"; Kowalská, "Neue Wege zur Bewältigung der Geschichte der Slowakei in den 1990er Jahren"; Hrabovec, "Zehn Jahre nach der Wende. Slowakische Historiographie: Ein schwieriger Weg zur Selbstverantwortung"; Kováč, "Probleme der sozialhistorischen Forschung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in der slowakischen Historiographie," idem, "Die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung und die Sozialgeschichte in der slowakischen Historiographie seit 1945"; Krajčovičová, "Slovenská historiografia o dejinách medzivojnovnej ČSR," Rychlík, "První Československá republika v slovenské ľudácké a neoludácké historiografii"; Lipták, "Slovenská historiografia o medzivojnovom Československu"; Stolárik, "The Painful Birth of Slovak Historiography in the 20th century".
- 14 Kováč, *O slovenskej historiografii v Collegium Carolinum*, 233.
- 15 <http://www.dejiny.sk/>
- 16 *Historický časopis*, 39, 1991, č. 4–5, *Historický časopis*, 45, 1997, č. 1, *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002, č. 1.
- 17 Kováč, "Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia".
- 18 <http://www.ainova.sk/>

- 19 <http://www.dejiny.sk/Spolky/Komisie/SDK/sdk.htm>
- 20 <http://www.history.sav.sk/centrum.htm>
- 21 <http://www.dejiny.sk/Spolky/Komisie/Cskom/>
- 22 Bohumila Ferenčuhová and other colleagues cooperate with the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris, with CeFRéS – Centre Français de Recherches en Sciences Sociales in Prague and also with the Central European Centre at the University of Nancy. The works published on the basis of the cooperation are: “Français, Tcheques et Slovaques pendant la Première Guerre mondiale,” in *Guerres mondiales et conflits contemporains* 169, Janvier 1993; Ferenčuhová (ed.), *La France et l’Europe centrale. Les relations entre la France et l’Europe centrale en 1867–1914. Impacts et images reciproques*; Ferenčuhová (ed.) Milan Rastislav Štefánik. *Astronome, soldat, grande figure franco-slovaque et européenne*, 197–264; Čičaj and Pickl (eds.), *Städtisches Alltagsleben in Mitteleuropa vom Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts*; Csáky and Mannová (ed.), *Kolektívne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny*; Stekl and Mannová (ed.), *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich*.
- 23 Cooperation in the project European Doctorate in Social History and Mediterranean, granted by EU (Maria Curie Fellowships).
- 24 Kováč (ed.), *Slovak contributions to the 19th international Congress of Historical Sciences*.
- 25 *Bohemia* 42, 2001 and *Historický časopis*, 52, 2004, 2.
- 26 See Marsina, “O istých črtách terajšieho stavu slovenskej historiografie,” 8.
- 27 <http://www.historiarevue.sk/>
- 28 <http://www.dejiny.sk/histcas.htm>
- 29 *Studia Historica Slovaca* is the only historical periodical published regularly in English.
- 30 Apart from *Studia historica nitriensia*, the following publications are also expert and specialist local periodicals: *Slavica slovaca*, *Historica Carpatica* (Košice), *Historický zborník* (Historical Miscellany, Martin), *Human Affairs* (Bratislava, Slovak Academy of Sciences), *Zborník Filozofickej a Pedagogickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského* (Miscellany of the Faculties of Philosophy and Education of Comenius University), *Zborník Muzeálnej slovenskej spoločnosti* (Miscellany of the Slovak Museum Society, Martin), *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea – História* (Miscellany of the Slovak National Museum – History, Bratislava, *Acta historica Neosoliensia Banská Bystrica*), *Acta Nitriensia* (Nitra), *Acta Universitatis Matthiae Belii* (Banská Bystrica), *Asian and African Studies*, *Bibliografický zborník* (Bibliographic Miscellany, Martin), *Bibliografické štúdie* (Martin) and *Genealogicko-heraldický hlas* (The Genealogical-Heraldic Voice, Martin). Various other institutions, especially museums and schools, also have their own periodicals.
- 31 Lipták, “Slovo k slovenskej historiografii,” 375.
- 32 *Sympóziium Slovensko v politickom systéme Česko-slovenska v rokoch 1918–1938* (Symposium on Slovakia in the political system of Czechoslovakia

- in 1918–1938), 1991; *Medzinárodné sympóziu o mestách v Podunajskom priestore* (International symposium on the cities in the Danubian area), 1991; *Cyrilo-metodské dedičstvo a počiatky kultúry na Slovensku* (The heritage of Cyril and Methodius and the beginnings of culture in Slovakia), 1991; *Seminár o národe a národnostiach* (Seminar on the nation and nationalities), 1991; *Milan Hodža, štátnik a politik* (Milan Hodža, Statesman and Politician), 1992; *Sympóziu o stave a perspektívach spracovania náboženských a cirkevných dejín na Slovensku* (Symposium on the state and perspectives of research in religious and church history in Slovakia), 1993; *Vojenskopolitické a geopolitické súvislosti vývoja Slovenska v rokoch 1918–1945* (The military, political and geopolitical contingency of the development of Slovakia in 1918–1945), 1992; *SNP v pamäti národov* (The Slovak National Uprising in the memory of the nations), 1995; *Literatúra a Slovenské národné povstanie* (Literature and the Slovak National Uprising), 1995; *Slovensko v habsburskej monarchii 1526–1918* (Slovakia in the Habsburg monarchy 1526–1818), 2000; *Národná rada v kontexte slovenských dejín, 150. výročie vzniku prvej slovenskej národnej rady* (National Council in the context of Slovak history, 150th Anniversary of the establishment of the first Slovak national council). See also Švorc and Harbuřová (eds.), *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatke novodobých dejín 1848–1918; Prvé povojnové voľby v strednej a juhovýchodnej Európe; Česi na Slovensku. Zborník z konferencie Česi na Slovensku* (The Czechs in Slovakia. Collections of papers from the Conference The Czechs in Slovakia), Martin, Slovenské národné múzeum 2000.
- 33 Bystrický (ed.), *Slovensko v rokoch druhej svetovej vojny*; Bystrický (ed.), *Slovensko v politickom systéme Československa*; Bystrický and Fano (eds.), *Slovensko na konci druhej svetovej vojny (stav, východiská, perspektívy)*; Pešek (ed.), *V tieni totality. Politické perzekúcie na Slovensku v rokoch 1948–1953*.
- 34 For instance, on Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Central Europe (1991), on the history of the Czech- Slovak-French relations (1989 in Prague, 1990 in Paris); on Czechoslovakism (1991, Prague); on Czechs and Slovaks in Central Europe (1993, Brno).
- 35 Baláž, (ed.), *Slovenské vystaňovalectvo. Dokumenty. 5. Pramene k dejinám slovenského vystaňovalectva do Francúzska a Belgicka v rokoch 1920–1945*.
- 36 Kamenec, Prečan and Škorvánek (eds.), *Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939–1945). Dokumenty*.
- 37 Petruf, *Politické vzťahy medzi Francúzskom a Československom a Francúzskom a Slovenskom (1939–1948)*.
- 38 Valachovič, et al., *Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. 1.*; Marsina (ed.), *Slovensko očami cudzincov. Vzácné správy o histórii nášho územia od 6. do 10. storočia, tak ako sa javia v písomnostiach prevažne cudzieho pôvodu. Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. 2.*
- 39 Hučko (ed.), *Bratislava a počiatky slovenského národného obrozenia*.

- 40 Čaplovič, et al., *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti*. Zv. 1; Beňko, et al., *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti*. Zv. 2.; Deák (ed.), *Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty*. Zv. 1 (20. september–2. november 1938.) and Deák (ed.), *Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty*. Zv. 2. *Okupácia* (2. november 1938–14. marec 1939).
- 41 The parallel use of the term “Slovak” and “Czecho-Slovak” history has its purpose. It is influenced by the orientation and the aim of the historiography to 1918–1993.
- 42 For example: *K Ústavnému vývoji v českých zemích a na Slovensku v letech 1938–1948. Studie*.
- 43 Antalová (ed.), *Verejnosť proti násiliu 1989–1991. Svedectvá a dokumenty*; Žatkuliak (ed.), *November 1989 a Slovensko. Chronológia a dokumenty* (1985–1990); Petruf, *Slovensko v rokoch 1989–1998. Dokumenty*. 2.; Šimulčík (ed.), *Dokumenty doby 1990–2000*.
- 44 Rychlík, Marzik and Bielik (eds.), *R. W. Seton-Watson and His Relations with the Czechs and Slovaks*.
- 45 Žatkuliak and Laluha (eds.), *Alexander Dubček. Od totality k demokracii*.
- 46 Fabricius and Suško (eds.), *Jozef Tiso. Prejavy a články*. Zv. 1. (1913–1938).
- 47 Hubenák (ed.), *Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1939–1945)*.
- 48 Nižňanský (ed.), *Holokaust na Slovensku. Obdobie autonómie* (6.10.1938–14.3.1939). *Dokumenty*. [Zv. 1.].
- 49 Fábry, et al., *Obžalovaný prehovori. Dokumenty z dejín Maďarov v Československu*.
- 50 *Dokumenty. Zborník medzinárodných dohôd, vyhlásení a zákonov Slovenskej republiky o právach národnostných menšín*. Zv. 1–2.
- 51 *Malá slovenská encyklopédia. Encyclopaedia Beliana*. (A Concise Slovak Encyclopedia Beliana) Bratislava Encyklopedický ústav SAV - Goldpress Publishers 1993; Strhan - Daniel (eds.), *Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia; Kronika Slovenska*. Zv. 1. *Od najstarších čias do konca 19. storočia*.
- 52 Škvarna, et al., *Slovak History Chronology and Lexicon. Lexikon der slowakischen Geschichte*.
- 53 Nižňanský, et al., *Kto bol kto za 1. ČSR, Q111, 1993* (includes also a lexicon of historical terms); *Priekopníci vedy a techniky na Slovensku 3*.
- 54 Majtán (ed.), *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka I.-II.*
- 55 *Slovenský biografický slovník (Slovak Biographical Lexicon)*, Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988 (I,II) 1989 (III) 1990 (IV) 1992 (V), 1994 (VI).
- 56 *Bibliografický slovník etnografie a folkloristiky za roky 1986–1990*, Bratislava, Ústav etnologie SAV, 1994 (since the year of 1960); Botík - Slavkovský (eds.), *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska*. Zv. 1.-2.; Kovačevićová (ed.), *Etnografický atlas Slovenska. Mapové zobrazenie vybraných javov ľudovej kultúry*.
- 57 Rusinová, et al., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia 20. storočia*.
- 58 Mistrík, et al., *Slovenské divadlo v 20. storočí*.

- 59 See Sedliaková, *Historiografia na Slovensku 1990–1994* and *Slovenská historiografia 1995–1999*.
- 60 Kamenec, “Stereotypy v slovenských dejinách a v slovenskej historiografii,” 339–344
- 61 Petruf, “Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990–1994,” 154.
- 62 Textbooks for 7th and 8th class of secondary school were written by Kowalská, Kováč and Lipták *Kapitoly z dejín pre stredné školy 1914–1948* was written by Kováč and Lipták.
- 63 Textbooks published in the publishing house Orbis Pictus Istropolitana or for example *Slovenské dejiny* by Milan Ferko, Richard Marsina, Viliam Čičaj, Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták.
- 64 Špiesz, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebevedomeniu*; Ďurica, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*.
- 65 Kováč, “Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia,” 6.
- 66 Ďurčanský, *Biela kniha – Právo Slovákov na samostatnosť vo svetle dokumentov* 1989; Vnuk, *Neuveriteľné sprisahanie*; Dies Ater – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944; Kirschbaum (ed.), *Krvácajúca hranica*.
- 67 Čarnogurský, 14. marec 1939; 6. október 1938; Sidor, *Takto vznikol Slovenský štát*; Kružliak – Okál (eds.), *Svedectvo jednej generácie*; Okál, *Výpredaj ľudskosti.....Slovensko*; Medrický, *Minister spomína*; Körper-Zrinsky, *Môj život*.
- 68 See Jablonický, *Spomienky a životopisy ľudských predstaviteľov publikované po roku 1989*; *Historický časopis*, 43, 2, 1995, Sidor, *Takto vznikol Slovenský štát*, first published in 1971 in the USA.
- 69 Májek, Dr. Jozef Tiso. *Zborník z vedeckého seminára 22. september 2001*; Rašla – Žabkay, *Proces s dr. Jozefom Tisom*; Ďurica, *Jozef Tiso slovenský kňaz a štátnik, 1887–1939*; Čulen, *Po Svätoplukovi druhá naša hlava*; Murín, *Spomienky a svedectvo*; *Slovenský rodolub Dr. Jozef Tiso (1887–1947)*; Bystrický (ed.), *Pokus o politický a osobný profil Jozefa Tisu*; *Prezident Jozef Tiso očami obhajcu Dr. Martina Greču*.
- 70 Bartlová, *Andrej Hlinka*, Bielik – Borovský (ed.), *Andrej Hlinka a jeho miesto v slovenských dejinách*.
- 71 Vnuk, *Mat' svoj štát znamená život. Politická biografica Alexandra Macha*.
- 72 Ďurica, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*.
- 73 *Stanovisko ku knihe M. S. Ďuricu: Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* (Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1998).
- 74 Kirschbaum, *A History of Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival*; Toma and Kováč, *Slovakia. From Samo to Dzurinda*.
- 75 In this case it is the Slovak World Congress.
- 76 Ďurica, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov*.
- 77 Compare: Winkler, *Pohľad z blízka i z diaľky: Výskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredoeurópske diskusie*, 247–260.
- 78 Horváth, *Neuvážení návrh na zrušenie slovenskej transkripcie starých rodových mien a priezvisk*. 306–315.

- 79 *Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990)* (Slovak Biographic Lexicon. From 833 Until 1990). Vols. 3–7. K–L.
- 80 Mannová (ed.), *Krátké dejiny Slovenska*.
- 81 Podoba, *Národná identita a 'Erinnerungspolitik' v slovenskej historiografii: niekoľko kritických postrehov od 'susedov'* 263.
- 82 See the chapter on Czech historiography after 1989.
- 83 Holec, "Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peňazí na poľudštení historika)," 27.
- 84 Mannová, "Clio na slovenský spôsob," (Clio in Slovak Mode), 243.
- 85 Kováč, "Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia," 8.
- 86 Holec, "Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peňazí na poľudštení historika)," 26.
- 87 Compare Ivantyšinová, "O probléme kontinuity a diskontinuity historiografie všeobecných dejín na Slovensku," 102–106.
- 88 Valachovič, (ed.), *Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov* vols., 1–2: *Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov*; Marsina (ed.), *Slovensko očami cudzincov. Vzácné správy o histórii nášho územia od 6. do 10. storočia, tak ako sa javia v písomnostiach prevažne cudzieho pôvodu*.
- 89 Nitra. *Príspevky k najstarším dejinám mesta*. Cilinská (ed.), *K problematike osídlenia stredodunajskej oblasti vo včasnóm stredoveku*; Plachá - Hlavicová - Keller, *Slovanský Devín*.
- 90 Fusek, *Slovensko vo včasnოსlovenskom období*; Steinhübel, *Veľkomoravské územie v severovýchodnom Zadunajsku*; Steinhübel, *Nitrianske kniežatstvo*.
- 91 Avenárius, *Byzantská kultúra v slovanskom prostredí v 6.–12. storočí*; Avenárius, *Die byzantinische Kultur und die Slawen*.
- 92 *Svätopluk 894 - 1994*. Kučera (ed.), *Slovaks in the Central Danubian Region in the 6th to 11th Century*.
- 93 Sedlák (ed.), *Pod vládou anjouovských kráľov. Slovensko po vymretí Arpádovcov a nástupe Anjouovcov na uhorský trón, Karola Róberta, Ľudovíta Veľkého a jeho dcéry Márie*; Dvořák (ed.), *V kráľovstve svätého Štefana. Vznik uhorského štátu a čas arpádovských kráľov*.
- 94 Bartl (ed.), *Prvý cisár na uhorskom tróne. Slovensko v čase polstoročnej vlády uhorského, českého, lombardského a nemeckého kráľa a rímskeho cisára Žigmunda Luxemburského, syna Karola IV.*
- 95 Halaga, *Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly*; Marsina (ed.), *Städte im Donauraum. Sammelband der Beiträge aus dem Symposium in Smolenice 30. 9.– 3. 10. 1991*.
- 96 Varsik, *Kontinuita medzi veľkomoravskými Slovienmi a stredovekými severouhorskými Slovanmi (Slovákmi)*. Varsik, *Slovanské (slovenské) názvy riek na Slovensku a ich prevzatie Maďarmi v 10. – 12. storočí*.
- 97 Múcska (ed.), *Kronika anonymného notára kráľa Bela. Gesta Hungarorum*.
- 98 Tandlich, "Židia v stredovekom Uhorsku," 6–7, Marsina, "Das Judentum in der Slowakei im Mittelalter," 23–35, Horváth, "Typy židovských osád. Párovce, Židovská Veča, Šarišské Lúky, Huncovce," 8–9.

- 99 Rusina and Zervan, *Životopisy svätcov. (Ikonografia.)*
- 100 Pöss, *Kapitoly z vedeckého života v Bratislave.*
- 101 Múdra, *Dejiny hudobnej kultúry na Slovensku II. Klasicismus.*
- 102 *Dejiny Slovenska III. Od roku 1848 do konca 19. Storočia.*
- 103 Čierna-Lantayová, *Pohľady na východ. (Postoje k Rusku v slovenskej politike 1934–1944.)*
- 104 Dangl and Kopčan, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 2. 1526–1711*; Dangl and Segeš, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 3. 1711–1914*; Hronský, Krivá and Čaplovič, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 4. 1914–1939*; Klein, Ruttkay and Marsina, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 1. Stručný náčrt do roku 1526.*
- 105 Jablonický, *Podoby násilia (Štátna bezpečnosť 1945–51)*; Špetko, *Lišky kontra ježe. Slovenská politická emigrácia 1948–1989*; Marušiak, *Slovenská literatúra a moc v druhej polovici päťdesiatych rokov*; Pešek, *Slovensko v rokoch 1953–1957. Kapitoly z politického vývoja*; Barnovský, *Prvá vlna destalinizácie a Slovensko (1953–1957)*; Londák, Sikora and Londáková, *Predjarie.*
- 106 Kováč, et al., *Muži deklarácie*; Švorc, *Rozbýjali monarchiu (Populárny slovník osobností česko-slovenského odboja 1914–1918.)*; Michálek – Krajčovičová, et al., *Do pamäti národa. Osobnosti slovenských dejín prvej polovice 20. storočia.*
- 107 Štvrtecký, *Náš Milan Rastislav Štefánik*; Juriček, M.R. *Štefánik*, Zuberec, *Milan Rastislav Štefánik – léta hvězdá a válečná*; Vároš, *Posledný let generála Štefánika*; Marsina, *Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatovi II.*; Kollár, *Milan Hodža, moderný teoretik, pragmatický politik*; Pekník, *Milan Hodža. Štátnik a politik*; Cambel, *Štátnik a národohospodár Milan Hodža 1878–1944*; Láluha, *Alexander Dubček. Politik a jeho doba*; Kováč, et al., *Muži deklarácie.*
- 108 Holec, *Poslední Habsburgovci a Slovensko*; Holec, “Neresti” slovenských národovcov z pred sto rokov,” 173–187; Holec, *Zabudnuté osudy (10 životných príbehov novodobých slovenských dejín).*
- 109 Tkáč, Návrat and Valach, *Mali sme bankárov?*; Tkáč and Návrat, *Synovia a otcovia.*
- 110 See also Dudeková, “Sociálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia na Slovensku – bilancia a nové impulzy,” 331–351.
- 111 *Dejiny Slovenska II. (1526–1848).* [History of Slovakia II (1526–1848)] *Dejiny Slovenska III. (od roku 1848 až do konca 19. storočia)* [History of Slovakia III (1848 until the end of the 19th Century)].
- 112 Eubomír Lipták, Eva Kowalská, Elena Mannová and Roman Holec. See also Mannová (ed.), *Concise History of Slovakia*; Mannová (ed.), *Krátko dejiny Slovenska.*
- 113 Mannová (ed.), *Bürgertum und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der Slowakei, 1900–1989*; Csáky and Mannová (eds.), *Kolektívne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny*; Stekl and Mannová (eds.), *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich.*
- 114 <http://www.korall.szoc.elte.hu/>

- 115 There is a Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV (Institute of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences) in Košice and Slovak Historical Society has its section for economic and social history. The first works on identities and attitudes, the second one focuses on economic history. However, there are no periodicals devoted to social history.
- 116 Mikloško, *Nebudete ich môcť rozvrátiť. Osudy katolíckej cirkvi na Slovensku. 1943–1989*; Hlinka, *Sila slabých a slabosť silných. Cirkev na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1989*; Pešek and Barnovský, *Pod kuratelou moci. Cirkev na Slovensku v rokoch 1953–1970*; Pešek and Barnovský, *Štátna moc a cirkev na Slovensku 1948–1953*; *Lexikon katolíckych kňazských osobností Slovenska*.
- 117 Pichler, *Národovci a občania. O slovenskom politickom myslení v 19. storočí*; Bakoš, *Kapitoly z dejín slovenského myslenia*; Bakoš, *Question of the nation in Slovak though. Several chapters on the national thought in modern Slovakia*; Mlynárik, *Pražané na Slovensku ve 20. stoloetí*; Mlynárik, *Českí profesori na Slovensku*.
- 118 Švorc, "Slovenská historiografia a regionálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia," 295–308.
- 119 Spiš as a 'German' region, Komárno, Southern Slovakia and partly Eastern Slovakia as 'Hungarian' regions.
- 120 Tibenský, *Poctivá obec budmerická. Starodávna história. Každodenný život slovenskej dediny od najstarších čias do začiatku 18. storočia*.
- 121 Kováč, *Nemecko a nemecká menšina na Slovensku (1871–1945)*; Gabzdilova – Olejník, *Odsun nemeckej menšiny zo Spiša v rokoch 1945–1948*. In *Spiš v kontinuite času*. 214–221; results of the research project *Postavenie nemeckej minority v regióne Spiša v rokoch 1918–1948 a zmeny jeho etnickej identity* (The status of the German minority in the region of Spiš in 1918–1948 and the changes of its ethnic identity) led by Soňa Gabzdilová (Košice) and Peter Švorc (Prešov); Gabzdilová, "Nemecká menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1947–1950," In *Etnické minority na Slovensku. História, súčasnosť, súvislosti*, 114–123.
- 122 http://www.muzeum.sk/muzeum/default.php?co=mk_kn_snm
- 123 Chmel, *Moja maďarská otázka: zo zápiskov posledného československého veľvyslanca v Maďarsku*; Kusý, *Čo s našimi Maďarmi?*
- 124 Šutaj, *Maďarská menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1948. Východiská a prax politiky k maďarskej menšine na Slovensku*; Šutaj, *Reslovakizácia. Zmena národnosti časti obyvateľstva Slovenska po 2. svetovej vojne*; Gabzdilová, *Školy s maďarským vyučovacím jazykom na Slovensku po druhej svetovej vojne*.
- 125 <http://www.foruminst.sk/>
- 126 Vég, (ed.), *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjteményének bibliográfiája* (1918–2000).
- 127 Bratislava – P. Salner, I. Kamenec, P. Larišová, Topoľčanky – R. Y. Büchler, A. Jamrichová-James, Nitra – L. Könyözysová, Piešťany – K. Psicová, Prešov – P. Kónya, D. Landa, Trnava – V. Slnková, Trenčín – M. Vrzgulová, Šafa – R. Kuklovský.
- 128 Gál (ed.), *Židia v interakcii* (Jews in Interaction); Gál (ed.), *Židia dnes*.

-
- 129 <http://www.nadaciamilanasimecku.sk/>
- 130 Kamenec, *Po stopách tragédie*; Lipscher, *Židia v slovenskom štáte 1939–1945*.
- 131 Kamenec, et al., *Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939–1945). Dokumenty*; Hubenák (ed.), *Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1938–1945). Dokumenty*; Nižňanský (ed.), *Holocaust na Slovensku. Dokumenty. Obdobie autonómie 6.10.1938–14.3.1939*; Nižňanský and Kamenec (eds.), *Dokumenty o holokauste na Slovensku. Prezident, vláda, Snem Slovenskej republiky a Štátna rada o židovskej otázke 1939–1945*; Hradská, *Dokumenty o holokauste na Slovensku. Listy Gizely Fleischmannovej (1942–1944)*; Nižňanský (ed.), *Dokumenty nemeckej proveniencie (1939–1945)*.
- 132 Salner, *Prežili holokaust*.
- 133 Salner, *Židia medzi tradíciou a asimiláciou*.
- 134 Mannová, (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia*.
- 135 <http://www.ivo.sk/>
- 136 <http://www.nadaciamilanasimecku.sk/>
- 137 Kónya, *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 1. (Od praveku do roku 1918.)*; *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 2. (1918–1946)*.
- 138 Zelinová (ed.), *Česi na Slovensku*.
- 139 Radičová (ed.), *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 1–5. Prvá Československá republika*; Kamenec and Fialová (eds.), *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 6*.
- 140 *Česko-slovenská historická ročenka 2000*. Texts by J. Rychlík, V. Goněc, Z. Beneš, etc.
- 141 Salner, *Taká bola Bratislava. Bratislavčania Bratislavačanom o Bratislave*; Salner and Luther (eds.), *Etnicita a mesto. Etnicita ako faktor polarizácie mestského spoločenstva v 20. storočí*.
- 142 Csáky and Mannová (eds.), *Kolektívne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny*; Bačová (ed.), *Historická pamäť a identita*; Bačová and Kusá (eds.), *Identity v meniacej sa spoločnosti*.
- 143 Kiliánová (ed.), *Identita etnických spoločenstiev. Výsledky etnologických výskumov*; Kiliánová and Riečanská (eds.), *Identities of Ethnic Group and Communities. The Results of Slovak Ethnological Research*.
- 144 Mannová and Daniel (eds.), *A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia*.
- 145 Recently the Slovak historical society has about 400 members. The number is slightly sinking. <http://www.dejiny.sk/shs/> In the Slovak bibliography for the first half of 90s there are about 1000 names and for the second half of 90s there are about 2000 names. Among them there are also non-Slovak authors and authors from related disciplines.
- 146 The most recent publications on Slovak history with the greatest impact are: Nurmi, *Slovakia. A playground for nationalism and national identity*; Bakke, *Doomed or failure? The Czechoslovak nation project and the Slovak autonomist reaction 1918–1938*; Cornelius, *In search of the nation. The new generation of Hungarian youth in Czechoslovakia 1925–1934*; Rudinski, *Incipient feminists. Women writers in the Slovak national revival*.

- 147 Jelinek, "Historiografia o Slovensku v Izraeli. Historiography on Slovakia in Israel," 707–713; Jakešová, "Kanadská historiografia, etnické skupiny a Slováci," 136–140; Kovtun (ed.), *Czech and Slovak History. An American Bibliography*; Šutaj – Vovkanyč, *Súčasná ruská historiografia o československých dejinách v rokoch 1945–1948*, 11–26. See also Winkler, "Pohľad zblízka a zďaľky: Výskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredo európske diskusie," 247–260.
- 148 Rychlík, *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století. I–II*.
- 149 Mannová (ed.), *A Concise History of Slovakia; Krátke dejiny Slovenska*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ingrid Antalová, ed., *Verejnosť proti násiliu 1989–1991. Svedectvá a dokumenty* [The Public Against Violence. Testimonies and Documents] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1998)
- Alexander Avenárius, *Byzantská kultúra v slovanskom prostredí v 6. – 12. storočí* [Byzantine Culture in the Slavonic Surrounding in the 6th to 12th century] (Bratislava: Veda, Historický ústav SAV, 1992)
- Alexander Avenárius, *Die byzantinische Kultur und die Slawen* [Byzantine Culture and the Slavs] (Wien: R. Oldenbourg, 2000)
- Viera Bačová, ed., *Historická pamäť a identita* [Historical Memory and Identity] (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1996)
- Viera Bačová and Zuzana Kusá, eds., *Identity v meniacej sa spoločnosti* [Identities in Changing Societies] (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1997)
- Elizabeth Bakke, *Doomed or failure? The Czechoslovak Nation Project and the Slovak Autonomist Reaction 1918–1938*. Series of dissertations submitted to the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo, No. 11/99. (Oslo: 1998)
- Vladimír Bakoš, *Kapitoly z dejín slovenského myslenia* [Chapters on the History of Slovak Thought] (Bratislava: Polygrafia SAV, 1995)
- Vladimír Bakoš, *Question of the Nation in Slovak Thought. Several Chapters on the National Thought in Modern Slovakia*. (Bratislava: Veda. 1999)
- Claude Baláž, ed., *Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo. Dokumenty. 5. Pramene k dejinám slovenského vyst'ahovalectva do Francúzska a Belgicka v rokoch 1920–1945* [Slovak Emigration. Documents 5. Sources for the History of the Slovak Emigration to France and Belgium during the years of 1920–1945] (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1990)
- Michal Barnovský, *Prvá vlna destalinizácie a Slovensko (1953–1957)* [First Wave of Destalinization and Slovakia (1953–1957)] (Brno: Prius, 2002)
- Július Bartl, ed., *Prvý cisár na uhorskom tróne. Slovensko v čase polstoročnej vlády uhorského, českého, lombardského a nemeckého kráľa a rímskeho cisára Žig-*

- munda Luxemburského, syna Karola IV.* [First Emperor on the Hungarian Throne. Slovakia in the Period of the Half-Century Rule of Sigismund of Luxemburg, Czech, Lombardian and German King and Roman Emperor, Son of Charles IV] (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2001)
- Alena Bartlová, *Andrej Hlinka* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1991)
- Ján Beňko, et al., *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti. Zv. 2.* [Documents on Slovak National Identity and Statehood. Vol. 2] (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum - Dom slovenskej literatúry, 1998)
- František Bielik – Štefan Borovský, ed., *Andrej Hlinka a jeho miesto v slovenských dejinách* [Andrej Hlinka and His Place in Slovak History] (Bratislava: Da Vel S. I.: Mestský úrad v Ružomberku, 1991)
- František Bokes, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov od najstarších čias až po prítomnosť* [The History of Slovakia and the Slovaks from the Earliest Times to the Present] (Bratislava: SAVU, 1946)
- Ján Botík and Peter Slavkovský, eds., *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska. Zv. 1.–2.* [Encyclopedia of the Folk Culture in Slovakia. Vol. 1 and 2] (Bratislava: Veda, 1995)
- Valerián Bystrický, ed., *Pokus o politický a osobný profil Jozefa Tisu* [Attempting a Political and Personal Profile of Jozef Tiso] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1992)
- Valerián Bystrický, *Prezident Jozef Tiso očami obhajcu Dr. Martina Greču* [Jozef Tiso Through the Eyes of Defense Attorney Dr. Martin Greča] (Partizánske: Garmond, 1993)
- Valerián Bystrický, ed., *Slovensko v politickom systéme Československa* [Slovakia in the Political System of Czechoslovakia] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1992)
- Valerián Bystrický, *Slovensko v rokoch druhej svetovej vojny* [Slovakia during the Years of the Second World War] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1991)
- Valerián Bystrický and Štefan Fano, eds., *Slovensko na konci druhej svetovej vojny (stav, východiská, perspektívy)* [Slovakia at the End of the WWII (State, Standpoints, Perspectives)] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1994)
- Samuel Cambel, *Štátnik a národohospodár Milan Hodža 1878–1944* [Statesman and Economist Milan Hodža 1878–1944] (Bratislava: Veda, 2001)
- Rudolf Chmel, *Moja maďarská otázka: zo zápisok posledného československého veľvyslanca v Maďarsku* [My Hungarian Question: from the Memoirs of the Last Czechoslovak Ambassador in Hungary] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1996)
- Deborah S. Cornelius, *In Search of the Nation. The New Generation of Hungarian Youth in Czechoslovakia 1925–1934* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998)
- Moritz Csáky – Elena Mannová, ed., *Kolektívne identity v strednej Európe v období moderny.* [Collective Identities in Central Europe in the Modern Period] (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 1999)

- Dušan Čaplovič, et al., *Dokumenty slovenskej národnej identity a štátnosti*. Zv. 1 [Documents on Slovak National Identity and Statehood. Vol. 1] (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum – Dom slovenskej literatúry, 1998)
- Pavol Čarnogurský, *14. marec 1939* [14th March 1939] (Bratislava: Veda, 1992)
- Pavol Čarnogurský, *6. október 1938* [6th October 1938] (Bratislava: SAV, 1993)
- Zlatica Čilinská, ed., *K problematike osídlenia stredodunajskej oblasti vo včasnom stredoveku* [On the Problems of the Settlement in the Central Danubian Region in the Early Middle Ages] (Nitra: Archeologický ústav SAV, 1991)
- Viliam Čičaj and Othmar Pickl, eds., *Städtisches Alltagsleben in Mitteleuropa vom Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhundert* (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 1998)
- Dagmar Čierna-Lantayová, *Pohľady na východ. (Postoje k Rusku v slovenskej politike 1934–1944.)* [Views on the East. Attitudes Towards Russia in Slovak Politics 1934–1944] (Bratislava: Veda, 2002)
- Konštantín Čulen, *Po Svätoplukovi druhá naša hlava* [After Svätopluk Our Second Head] (Partizánske: Garmond S.I.: Priatelia prezidenta Tisu v cudzine a na Slovensku, 1992)
- Vojtech Dangl and Vojtech Kopčan, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 2. 1526–1711* [Military History of Slovakia. Vol. 2. 1526–1711] (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1996)
- Vojtech Dangl and Vladimír Segeš, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 3. 1711–1914* [Military History of Slovakia. Vol 3. 1711–1914] (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1996)
- Ladislav Deák ed., *Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 2. Okupácia (2. november 1938–14. marec 1939)* [Vienna Arbitrage of 2nd November 1938. Documents. Volume 2. The Occupation. (2nd November 1938–14th March 1939)] (Martin – Bratislava: Matica slovenská, 2003)
- Ladislav Deák ed., *Viedenská arbitráž 2. november 1938. Dokumenty. Zv. 1 (20. september–2. november 1938.)* [Vienna Arbitrage of 2nd November 1938. Documents. Volume 1 (20. september–2. november 1938)] (Martin – Bratislava: Matica slovenská, 2002)
- Ivan Dérer, *Československá otázka* [The Czechoslovak Question] (Praha: Orbis, 1935)
- Gabriela Dudeková, “Sociálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia na Slovensku – bilancia a nové impulzy,” [Social History of the 19th and 20th Century in Slovakia] in *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, pp. 331–351.
- Ferdinand Ďurčanský, *Biela kniha – Právo Slovákov na samostatnosť vo svetle dokumentov 1989* [A White Book – Right of Slovaks for Independence in the Light of Documents] (Buenos Aires: Lach, 1954)
- Milan Stanislav Ďurica, *Dejiny Slovenska a Slovákov* [History of Slovaks and Slovakia] (Bratislava: SPN, 1995, 2nd edition)

- Milan Stanislav Ďurica, *Jozef Tiso slovenský kňaz a štátnik, 1887–1939* [Jozef Tiso Slovak Priest and Statesman, 1887–1839] (Abano Treme: Piovan Editore, 1989)
- Pavel Dvořák, *V kráľovstve svätého Štefana. Vznik uhorského štátu a čas arpádovských kráľov* [In the Kingdom of St. Stephen. Establishment of the Hungarian State and the Era of the Arpád Dynasty] (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2003)
- Miroslav Fabricius and Ladislav Suško eds., *Jozef Tiso. Prejavy a články. Zv. 1. (1913–1938)*. [Jozef Tiso. Speeches and Articles] Vol. 1 (1913–1938) (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press - Historický ústav SAV, 2002)
- Zoltán Fábry, et al., *Obžalovaný prehovorí. Dokumenty z dejín Maďarov v Československu* [The Accused will Speak. Documents on the History of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1994)
- Bohumila Ferencuhová, ed., *La France et l'Europe centrale. Les relations entre la France et l'Europe centrale en 1867–1914. Impacts et images reciproques* (Bratislava: Spoločnosť pre dejiny a kultúru strednej a východnej Európy, 1995)
- Bohumila Ferencuhová, *Milan Rastislav Štefánik. Astronome, soldat, grande figure franco-slovaque et européenne* (Bratislava: 1999)
- Bohumila Ferencuhová, “Česko-slovensko-francouzská kolokvia z moderních dějin,” in *Moderní dějiny. Sborník k dějinám 19. a 20. století* 8, 2000, p. 197–264.
- Gabriel Fusek, *Slovensko vo včasnorslovanskom období* [Slovakia in early Moravian period] (Nitra: Archeologický ústav SAV, 1994)
- Soňa Gabzdilová, “Nemecká menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1947–1950,” [German Minority in Slovakia in 1947–1950]. In *Etnické minority na Slovensku. História, súčasnosť, súvislosti*. (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1997), pp. 114–123.
- Soňa Gabzdilová, *Školy s maďarským vyučovacím jazykom na Slovensku po druhej svetovej vojne* [Schools with Hungarian Teaching Language in Slovakia after the Second World War] (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1991)
- Egon Gál ed., *Židia dnes* [Jews Today] (Bratislava: Inštitút judaistiky Univerzity Komenského, 2003)
- Egon Gál ed., *Židia v interakcii* [Jews in Interaction] vols. 1–2 (Bratislava: Inštitút judaistiky Univerzity Komenského, 1997–1999)
- Ondrej R. Halaga, *Počiatky Košíc a zrod metropoly* [Beginnings of Košice and the Birth of a Metropolis] (Košice: Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1993)
- Andrej Hlinka, *Sila slabých a slabosť silných. Cirkev na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1989* [Power of the Poor and Defects of the Strong. Church in Slovakia in 1945–1989] (Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 1990)
- Roman Holec, *Zabudnuté osudy (10 životných príbehov novodobých slovenských dejín)* [Forgotten Fates: 10 Life Stories of the Modern Slovak History] (Martin: Matica slovenská, 2001)

- Roman Holec, "Historik a peniaze (alebo podiel peňazí na poľudštení historika)" [Historian and Money, or Participation of Money on the Humanization of a Historian]. In *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002 1, p. 27–26.
- Roman Holec, "Neresti" slovenských národovcov z pred sto rokov," ["Vices" of the Slovak Nationalists Hundred Years Ago]. In *Historické štúdie* 42, 2002, pp. 173–187.
- Roman Holec, *Poslední Habsburgovci a Slovensko* [The Last Habsburgs and Slovakia] (Bratislava: IKAR, 2001)
- Pavel Horváth, "Typy židovských osád. Párovce, Židovská Veča, Šarišské Lúky, Huncovce," [Types of Jewish Settlements. Párovce, Židovská Veča, Šarišské Lúky, Huncovce] in *Historická Revue* 6, 1995, 8, pp. 8–9.
- Pavel Horváth, "Neuvážený návrh na zrušenie slovenskej transkripcie starých rodových mien a priezvisk" [Ill-judged Proposal for the Abolishment of Slovak Transcription of Old Family Names] in *Historický časopis* 47, 2, 1999, pp. 306–315.
- Emilia Hrabovec, "Zehn Jahre nach der Wende. Slowakische Historiographie: Ein schwieriger Weg zur Selbstverantwortung," in *Österreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002.
- Katarína Hradská, *Dokumenty o holokauste na Slovensku. Listy Gizely Fleischmannovej (1942–1944)* [Documents on Holocaust in Slovakia. Letters of Gizela Fleischmann (1942–1944)] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, Židovská náboženská obec, 2003)
- Marián Hronský, Anna Krivá and Miloslav Čaplovič, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 4. 1914–1939.* [Military History of Slovakia. Vol. 4. 1914–1939] (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany SR, 1996)
- František Hrušovský, *Slovenské dejiny* [Slovak History] (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1939)
- Ladislav Hubenák, ed., *Riešenie židovskej otázky na Slovensku (1939–1945). Dokumenty* [Solution of the Jewish Question in Slovakia (1939–1945). Documents] parts 1–5. (Bratislava: SNM – Múzeum židovskej kultúry, 1994–2000)
- Ján Hučko, ed., *Bratislava a počiatky slovenského národného obrodzenia. Dokumenty* [Bratislava and the Beginnings of the Slovak National Rewakening. Documents] (Bratislava: Obzor pre Archív hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy, 1992)
- Tatiana Ivantyšinová, "O probléme kontinuity a diskontinuity historiografie všeobecných dejín na Slovensku" [On the Problem of Continuity and Discontinuity of Historiography of General History in Slovakia]. In *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002, 1, pp. 102–106.
- Jozef Jablonický, *Podoby násilia (Štátna bezpečnosť 1945–51)* [Forms of Violence: State Security 1945–51] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)
- Jozef Jablonický, *Spomienky a životopisy ľudáckych predstaviteľov publikované po roku 1989* [Memories and Biographies of the Ľudák Representatives Published After 1989] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)

- Elena Jakešová, "Kanadská historiografia, etnické skupiny a Slováci," [Canadian Historiography, Ethnic Groups and Slovaks]. In *Historické štúdie* 34, 1993, pp. 136–140.
- Yeshayahu Andrej Jelinek, "Historiografia o Slovensku v Izraeli. Historiography on Slovakia in Israel" in *Historický časopis* 40, 1992, 6, pp. 707–713.
- J. Juriček, M.R. Štefánik (Bratislava: Mladé letá, 1990) (first published in 1968)
- Ivan Kamenec, "Stereotypy v slovenských dejinách a v slovenskej historiografii," [Stereotypes in Slovak History and in Slovak Historiography] (Nitra: Studia historica Nitriensia, 2000) roč. 8, p. 339–344.
- Ivan Kamenec, *Po stopách tragédie* [Tracing the Tragedy] (Bratislava: Archa, 1991)
- Ivan Kamenec and Zuzana Fialová eds., *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 6.* [A Short History of the Czech-Slovak relations. Vol. 6] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1996)
- Ivan Kamenec, Vilém Prečan and Stanislav Škorvánek eds., *Vatikán a Slovenská republika (1939–1945). Dokumenty* [Vatican and Slovak Republic (1939–1945)] (Bratislava: Slovak Academic Press Historický ústav SAV Ústav soudobých dějin ČAV, 1992)
- Gabriela Kiliánová, ed., "Identita etnických spoločienstev. Výsledky etnologických výskumov" [Identity of the Ethnic Societies. Outcomes of Ethnological Research]. In *Etnologické štúdie* 5, Ústav etnológie SAV (Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAV, 1998)
- Gabriela Kiliánová and Eva Riečanská eds., "Identities of Ethnic Group and Communities. The Results of Slovak Ethnological Research." In: *Etnologické štúdie* 7, (Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAV, 2000)
- Jozef Kirschbaum, ed., *Krvácajúca hranica* [Bleeding Border] (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1994) [original edition 1940]
- Stanislav Kirschbaum, *A History of Slovakia. The Struggle for Survival.* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995)
- Bohuš Klein, Alexander Ruttkay and Richard Marsina, *Vojenské dejiny Slovenska. Zv. 1. Stručný náčrt do roku 1526* [Military History of Slovakia. Vol. 1. Brief outline up to 1526] (Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany Slovenskej republiky, 1994)
- Karol Kollár, *Milan Hodža, moderný teoretik, pragmatický politik* [Milan Hodža, Modern Theoretist, Pragmatic Politician] (Bratislava: Infopress, 1994)
- Z. Kollárová and J. Hanus, *Spríevodca po slovenských archívoch* [A Guide to Slovak Archives] (Prešov: Universum, 1999)
- Peter Kónya, *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi* (Od praveku do roku 1918) Zv. 1. [A Concise History of Subcarpathian Ruthenia (From Ancient Ages Until 1918)]. Vol. 1. (Prešov: Metodické centrum, 1996)
- Peter Kónya, *Stručné dejiny Podkarpatskej Rusi. Zv. 2. (1918–1946)* [A Concise History of Subcarpathian Ruthenia. Vol. 2 (1918–1946)] (Prešov: Metodické centrum, 1996)

- Dušan Kováč, ed., *Slovak contributions to the 19-th international Congress of Historical Sciences* (Bratislava: Veda, 2000)
- Dušan Kováč, et al., *Muži deklarácie* [Men of the Declaration] (Martin: Osveťa, 1991)
- Dušan Kováč, "Die Geschichte der Arbeitbewegung und die Sozialgeschichte in der slowakischen Historiographie seit 1945," in *Mitteilungsblatt des Instituts für soziale Bewegung* 23, 2000, pp.100–110.
- Dušan Kováč, "Die slowakische Historiographie nach 1989. Aktiva, Probleme, Perspektiven," in *Bohemia* 37, 1996, pp. 169–174.
- Dušan Kováč, "O slovenskej historiografii v Collegium Carolinum," [On the Slovak Historiography in Collegium Carolinum]. In *Historický časopis* 52, 2, 2004, p. 233.
- Dušan Kováč, "Paradoxa und Dilemmata der postkommunistischen Geschichtsschreibung," in *Österreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002 H. 1/2, pp. 15–41.
- Dušan Kováč, "Probleme der sozialhistorischen Forschung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert in der slowakischen Historiographie" *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 34, 1994, pp. 111–130.
- Dušan Kováč, "Slovenská historiografia desať rokov po. Zámery a ich realizácia," [Slovak Historiography Ten Years After. Intentions and their Realization]. In *Historický časopis*, 50, 2002, č.1
- Dušan Kováč, *Nemecko a nemecká menšina na Slovensku (1871–1945)* [Germany and German Minority in Slovakia (1871–1945)] (Bratislava: Veda, 1991)
- Soňa Kovačevičová, ed., *Etnografický atlas Slovenska. Mapové zobrazenie vybraných javov ľudovej kultúry* [Etnographic Atlas of Slovakia. Cartographic Depiction of the Selected Phenomena of the Folk Culture] (Bratislava: Veda - Slovenská kartografia, 1990; in English: 1994)
- George J. Kovtun, ed., *Czech and Slovak History. An American Bibliography* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1996)
- Eva Kowalská, "Neue Wege zur Bewältigung der Geschichte der Slowakei in den 1990er Jahren," in *Österreichische Osthefte* 44, 2002, H. ½, pp. 287–297.
- Eva Kowalská, Dušan Kováč and Ľubomír Lipták, *Kapitoly z dejín pre stredné školy 1914–1948* (Chapters on History for Secondary Schools 1914–1918)
- Karol Körper-Zrinsky, *Môj život* [My Life] (Bratislava: Lúč, 1993)
- Natália Krajčovičová, "Slovenská historiografia o dejinách medzivojnovnej ČSR," [Slovak Historiography on the History of the Interwar Czechoslovakia]. In Josef Harna, ed., *Reflexe dejín prvej Československé republiky v české a slovenské historiografii* (Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 1998) pp. 63–72.
- Imrich Kružliak and Ján Okáľ, eds., *Svedectvo jednej generácie* [Testimony of a Generation] (Cambridge, Ontario: Dobrá kniha, 1990)
- Matúš Kučera, ed., *Slovaks in the Central Danubian Region in the 6th to 11th Century*. (Bratislava: SNM, 2000)

- Miroslav Kusý, *Čo s našimi Maďarmi?* [What With Our Hungarians?] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1998)
- Ivan Luluha, *Alexander Dubček. Politik a jeho doba* [Alexander Dubček. Politician and His Era] (Bratislava: Nová Práca, 2000)
- Ladislav Lipscher, *Židia v slovenskom štáte 1939–1945* [Jews in the Slovak State 1939–1945] (Bratislava: Print-servis, 1992)
- Ľubomír Lipták, “Slovenská historiografia o medzivojnovom Československu,” [Slovak Historiography on the Inter-war Czechoslovakia]. In Jaroslav Valenta, Emil Voráček and Josef Harna eds., *Československo 1918–1938. Osudy demokracie ve střední Evropě* [Czechoslovakia 1918–1938. The Destiny of Democracy in Central Europe] (Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 1999), pp. 48–52.
- Ľubomír Lipták, “Slovo k slovenskej historiografii” [A Word on Slovak Historiography] in *Historický časopis* 52,2, 2004.
- Ľubomír Lipták, *Slovensko v 20. storočí* [Slovakia in the 20th Century] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1998).
- M. Londák, S. Sikora and E. Londáková, *Predjarie* (Bratislava: Veda, 2002)
- Stanislav Májek, *Dr. Jozef Tiso. Zborník z vedeckého seminára 22. september 2001* [Dr. Jozef Tiso. Miscellany of the Academic Seminar of the 22nd September 2001] (Bratislava: Spoločnosť Andreja Hlinku, 2002)
- Milan Majtán, ed., *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka I.-II.* [Historical Lexicon of Slovak Language I-II] (Bratislava: Veda, 1991–1992)
- Elena Mannová, “Clio na slovenský spôsob” [Clio in Slovak Mode]. In *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, p. 243
- Elena Mannová, ed., *Concise History of Slovakia* (Bratislava: Historický Ústav SAV, 2000)
- Elena Mannová, *Krátke dejiny Slovenska* [A Concise History of Slovakia] (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 2003)
- Elena Mannová and David Paul Daniel, ed., *A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia* (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1995)
- Richard Marsina, “Das Judentum in der Slowakei im Mittelalter” in *Juden im Grenzraum. Symposium im Rahmen der “Schlaininger Gespräche” vom 19.–23. September 1990 auf Burg Schlaining*. Eisenstadt, Burgenländischen Landesmuseum Eisenstadt 1993, pp. 23–35
- Richard Marsina, ed., *Städte im Donauraum. Sammelband der Beiträge aus dem Symposium in Smolenice 30. 9. – 3. 10. 1991* [Towns in the Danube region. Collection of papers from the symposium in Smolenice 30. 9. – 3. 10. 1991] (Bratislava - Pressburg 1291-1991 (Bratislava: Slovenská historická spoločnosť - Historický ústav SAV - Miestny úrad Bratislava-Staré mesto, 1993)
- Richard Marsina, *Štúdie k slovenskému diplomatáru II.* [Studies On Slovak Codex Diplomaticus II] (Bratislava: Veda, 1989)
- Richard Marsina, “A Guide to Historiography in Slovakia”. In *Studia historica Slovaca* 20, 1995.

- Richard Marsina, "O istých črtách terajšieho stavu slovenskej historiografie" [On Some Features of the Contemporary State of Slovak Historiography]. In *Historický Časopis*, 45, 1, 1997, p. 8.
- Richard Marsina, ed., *Slovensko očami cudzincov. Vzácné správy o histórii nášho územia od 6. do 10. storočia, tak ako sa javia v písomnostiach prevažne cudzieho pôvodu. Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. 2.* [Slovakia Through the Eyes of Foreigners. Valuable Statements on the History of our Territory as They Appear in the Writings of the Sources of Foreign Origin for the History of Slovakia and Slovaks] (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 1999)
- Juraj Marušiak, *Slovenská literatúra a moc v druhej polovici päťdesiatych rokov* [Slovak Literature in the Second Half of the Fifties] (Brno: Prius, 2001)
- Gejza Medrický, *Minister spomína* [Minister Thinking Back] (Bratislava: LITERA, 1993)
- František Mikloško, *Nebudete ich môcť rozvrátiť. Osudy katolíckej cirkvi na Slovensku. 1943–1989* [You Will Not Be Able to Disrupt Them. Destiny of the Catholic Church in Slovakia 1943–1989] (Bratislava: Archa, 1991)
- Slavomír Michálek and Natália Krajčovičová, et al., *Do pamäti národa. Osobnosti slovenských dejín prvej polovice 20. storočia* [To the Memory of the Nation. Personalities of Slovak History in the First Half of the 20th Century] (Bratislava: Veda, 2003)
- Miloš Mistrík, et al., *Slovenské divadlo v 20. storočí* [Slovak Theatre in the 20th Century] (Bratislava: Veda, 1999)
- Ján Mlynárik, *Českí profesori na Slovensku* [Czech Professors in Slovakia] (Praha: Danubius, 1994)
- Ján Mlynárik, *Pražané na Slovensku ve 20. storočí* [Praguers in Slovakia in the 20th Century] (Praha: Danubius, 2000)
- Darina Múdra, *Dejiny hudobnej kultúry na Slovensku II. Klasicizmus* [History of Musical Culture in Slovakia II. Classicism] (Bratislava: Slovenský hudobný fond, 1993)
- Karol Murín, *Spomienky a svedectvo* [Memories and Testimony] (Hamilton: Zahraničná Matica slovenská, 1987)
- Eduard Nižňanský, et al., *Kto bol kto za 1. ČSR* [Who Was Who During the First ČSR] (Bratislava: Q111, 1993)
- Eduard Nižňanský, *Priekopníci vedy a techniky na Slovensku 3.* [Pioneers of the Science and Technique in Slovakia 3] (Volumes 1-2 published in 1986 and 1988) (Bratislava: AEP, 1999)
- Eduard Nižňanský, ed., *Dokumenty nemeckej proveniencie (1939–1945)* [Documents of German Provenience 1939–1945] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 2003)
- Eduard Nižňanský, ed., *Holokaust na Slovensku. Obdobie autonómie (6.10.1938–14.3.1939). Dokumenty.* [Zv. 1.] [Holocaust in Slovakia. The Period of Autonomy (6.10.1938–14.3.1939) Documents] Vol. 1 (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku – Židovská náboženská obec, 2001)

- Eduard Nižňanský and Ivan Kamenec eds., *Dokumenty o holokauste na Slovensku. Prezident, vláda, Snem Slovenskej republiky a Štátna rada o židovskej otázke 1939–1945* [Documents on Holocaust in Slovakia. President, Government, Diet and the State Council on the Jewish Question 1939–1945] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku Židovská náboženská obec, 2003)
- Ismo Nurmi, *Slovakia. A Playground for Nationalism and National Identity. Manifestations of the National Identity of Slovaks 1918–1920* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1999)
- Ján Okál, *Výpredaj ľudskosti... Slovensko* [The Sell-out of Humanity...Slovakia] (Cambridge, Ontario: Dobrá kniha, 1989)
- Miroslav Pekník, *Milan Hodža. Štátnik a politik* [Milan Hodža. Statesman and Politician] (Bratislava: Veda, 1992)
- Jan Pešek, ed., *V tieni totality. Politické perzekúcie na Slovensku v rokoch 1948–1953* [In the Shadow of the Totality. Political Persecutions in Slovakia During the Years of 1948–1953] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV – Nadácia M. Šimečku, 1996)
- Jan Pešek, *Slovensko v rokoch 1953–1957. Kapitoly z politického vývoja* [Slovakia during the Years of 1953–1957. Chapters on the Political Development] (Brno: Prius, 2001)
- Jan Pešek and Michal Barnovský, *Štátna moc a cirkvi na Slovensku 1948–1953* [State Power and Churches in Slovakia 1948–1953] (Bratislava: Veda, 1997)
- Jan Pešek and Michal Barnovský, *Lexikon katolíckych kňazských osobností Slovenska* [Lexicon of the Catholic Priest Personalities in Slovakia] (Bratislava: Lúč, 2000)
- Jan Pešek and Michal Barnovský, *Pod kuratelou moci. Cirkvi na Slovensku v rokoch 1953–1970* [Under the Protection of the Power. Churches in Slovakia in years 1953–1970] (Bratislava: Veda, 1999)
- Pavol Petruf, “Die slowakische Historiographie in den Jahren 1990–1994.” In *Bohemia* 37 (1996), pp. 153–168.
- Pavol Petruf, *Politické vzťahy medzi Francúzskom a Československom a Francúzskom a Slovenskom (1939–1948). Výber z dokumentov* [Political Relations between France and Czechoslovakia and France and Slovakia 1939–1948. Selected Documents] (Martin: Matica slovenská, 2003)
- Pavol Petruf, *Slovensko v rokoch 1989–1998. Dokumenty. 2.* [Slovakia during the Years of 1989–1998. Documents 2.] (Prešov: Metodické centrum Prešov, 2000)
- Tibor Pichler, *Národovci a občania. O slovenskom politickom myslení v 19. storočí* [Nationalists and Citizens. On Slovak Political Thought in the 19th Century] (Bratislava: Veda, 1998)
- Veronika Plachá, Jana Hlavicová and Igor Keller, *Slovanský Devín* (Bratislava: Obzor pre Mestské múzeum v Bratislave, 1990)
- Juraj Podoba, “Národná identita a ‘Erinnerungspolitik’ v slovenskej historiografii: niekoľko kritických postrehov od ‘susedov’,” [National Identity and

- "Erinnerungspolitik" in Slovak Historiography: Some Critical Observations of our "Neighbours"] in *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, p. 263.
- Ondrej Pöss, *Kapitoly z vedeckého života v Bratislave* [Chapters on the Academic Life in Bratislava] (Bratislava: Veda, 1991)
- Albert Pražák, *Češi a Slováci. Literární dějepisné poznámky k československému poměru* [The Czechs and Slovaks. Literary Historiographic Comments on the Czechoslovak Relationship] (Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1929)
- Albert Pražák, *Československý národ* [The Czechoslovak Nation] (Bratislava: Academie, 1925)
- Iveta Radičová, ed., *Malé dejiny česko-slovenských vzťahov. Zv. 1–5. Prvá Československá republika*. [A Short History of the Czech-Slovak relations. Vol. 1–5. The First Czechoslovak Republic] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku, 1994–1995)
- Anton Rašla and Ernest Žabkay, *Proces s dr. Jozefom Tisom* [Process of Dr. Jozef Tiso] (Bratislava: Tatrapress, 1990)
- Norma L Rudinski, *Incipient Feminists. Women Writers in the Slovak National Revival* (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1991)
- Ivan Rusina, *Svätci v strednej Európe/ Heilige in Zentraleuropa* [Saints in Central Europe] (Bratislava: Slovenská národná galéria, 1993)
- Ivan Rusina and Marián Zervan, *Životopisy svätcov (Ikonografia)* [Biographies of Saints. Iconography] (Bratislava: Pallas, 1994);
- Z. Rusinová, et al., *Dejiny slovenského výtvarného umenia 20. storočia* [History of the Slovak Visual Art of the 20th Century] (Bratislava: Slovenská národná galéria, 2000)
- Jan Rychlík, "České, slovenské a československé dějiny—vztahy a souvislosti," [Czech, Slovak and Czechoslovak History—Relations and Connections]. In: *Československo 1918–1938* (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1999)
- Jan Rychlík, *První československá republika v slovenské ľudácké a neoľudácké historiografii* [The First Czechoslovak Republic in Slovak Ludák and neo-Ludák Historiography] in Josef Harna, ed., *Reflexe dějin první Československé republiky v české a slovenské historiografii*, (Praha: HÚ AV ČR, 1998)
- Jan Rychlík, *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století. [Diel 1.] Česko-slovenské vztahy 1914–1945* [Czechs and Slovaks in the 20th Century. Vol. 1. Czech-Slovak Relations 1914–1945] Vol. 2. *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století. [Diel 2.] Česko-slovenské vztahy 1945–1992*. [Czechs and Slovaks in the 20th Century. Vol. 2. Czech-Slovak Relations 1945–1992] (Bratislava – Prague: Academic Electronic Press v Bratislave a Ústav T.G. Masaryka v Praze, 1997)
- Jan Rychlík, Thomas D. Marzik and Miroslav Bielik, eds., *R.W.Seton-Watson and His Relations with the Czechs and Slovaks. R.W.Seton-Watson a jeho vzťahy k Čechům a Slovákům. R.W.Seton-Watson a jeho vzťahy k Čechom a Slovákovi. Documents. Dokumenty. 1906–1951. Zv. 1.* (Praha: Ústav T.G. Masaryka – MS, 1995)

- Peter Salner, *Prežili holokaust* [They Survived the Holocaust] (Bratislava: Veda Ústav etnológie SAV, 1997)
- Peter Salner, *Taká bola Bratislava. Bratislavčania Bratislvačanom o Bratislave* [Bratislavans to Bratislavans about Bratislava] (Bratislava: Veda, 1991)
- Peter Salner, *Židia medzi tradíciou a asimiláciou* [Jews Between Tradition and Assimilation] (Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV Židovská náboženská obec Bratislava, 2000)
- Peter Salner and Daniel Luther, eds., *Etnicita a mesto. Etnicita ako faktor polarizácie mestského spoločenstva v 20. storočí* [Ethnicity and City. Ethnicity as a co-Factor of the Polarization of the Urban Society in the 20th Century] (Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV, 2001)
- Vincent Sedlák, ed., *Pod vládou anjouovských kráľov. Slovensko po vymretí Árpádovcov a nástupe Anjouvcov na uhorský trón, Karola Róberta, Ľudovíta Veľkého a jeho dcéry Márie* [Under the Rule of the Anjou Kings. Slovakia After the Extinction of the Árpáds and Accession of the Anjous to the Hungarian Throne; Charles Robert, Louis the the Great and his Daughter Mary] (Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2002)
- Alžbeta Sedliaková, ed., "Slovenská historiografia 2000. Výberová bibliografia," [Slovak Historiography 2000. Selected Bibliography]. In *Historický časopis* 50, 2002, c. 4, pp. 699–754.
- Alžbeta Sedliaková, "Slovenská historiografia 2001. Výberová bibliografia," [Slovak Historiography 2001. Selected Bibliography]. In *Historický časopis* 51, 2003, c. 4, pp. 750–801.
- Alžbeta Sedliaková, *Historiografia na Slovensku 1990–1994. Výberová bibliografia* [Historiography in Slovakia 1990–1994. Selected Bibliography] (Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 1995)
- Alžbeta Sedliaková, ed., *Slovenská historiografia 1995–1999. Výberová bibliografia* [Slovak Historiography 1995–1999. Selected Bibliography] (Bratislava: Veda vydavateľstvo SAV-Historický ústav SAV, 2000)
- Karol Sidor, *Takto vznikol Slovenský štát* [This is How The Slovak State Was Created] (Bratislava: 1992; first published in 1971 in the USA)
- Ján Šimulčík, ed., *Dokumenty doby 1990–2000* [Documents of the Era 1990–2000] (Prešov: Vyd. Michala Vaška, 2002)
- Dušan Škvarna, et al., *Lexikon der slowakischen Geschichte* [Lexicon of Slovak History] (Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 2002)
- Dušan Škvarna, *Slovak History Chronology and Lexicon* (Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 2002)
- Dušan Škvarna, *Slovenský rodopub Dr. Jozef Tiso (1887–1947)* [Slovak Patriot Dr. Jozef Tiso] (1887–1947) (Trenčín: Ivan Štelcer, 1992)
- J. Špetko, *Líšky kontra ježe. Slovenská politická emigrácia 1948–1989* [Foxes contra Hedgehogs. Slovak Political Emigration 1948–1989] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2002)
- Anton Špiesz, *Dejiny Slovenska na ceste k sebevedomeniu* (Bratislava: Perfekt, 1992)

- Ján Steinhübel, *Nitrianske kniežatstvo* [The Principality of Nitra] (Bratislava: Veda Rak, 2004)
- Ján Steinhübel, *Veľkomoravské územie v severovýchodnom Zadunajsku* [Great Moravian Lands in the Northeastern Transdanubian region] (Bratislava: Veda, 1995)
- Hannes Stekl and Elena Mannová, eds., *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich* (Wien: WUV, 2003)
- Mark M. Stolarík, "The Painful Birth of Slovak Historiography in the 20th century," in *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 20, 2001, pp.161–187.
- Milan Strhan and David Paul Daniel, eds., *Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia* (Bratislava: Encyclopedical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences – Goldpress Publishers, 1994)
- Štefan Štvrtecký, *Náš Milan Rastislav Štefánik* [Our Milan Rastislav Štefánik] (Bratislava: Smena, 1990)
- Štefan Šutaj, *Maďarská menšina na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1948. Východiská a prax politiky k maďarskej menšine na Slovensku* [Hungarian Minority in Slovakia in 1945–1948. Standpoints and Practice of the Policy Towards the Hungarian Minority in Slovakia 1945–1948] (Bratislava: Veda, 1993)
- Štefan Šutaj, *Reslovakizácia. Zmena národnosti časti obyvateľstva Slovenska po 2. svetovej vojne* [Reslovakization, The Change of the Nationality of the Part of Inhabitants after the Second World War] (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1991)
- Peter Švorc, "Slovenská historiografia a regionálne dejiny 19. a 20. storočia" [Slovak Historiography and Regional History of the 19th and 20th Century]. In *Historický časopis*, 52, 2, 2004, pp. 295–308.
- Peter Švorc, *Rozbíjali monarchiu (Populárny slovník osobností česko-slovenského odboja 1914–1918.)* [They Were Breaking the Monarchy. (Popular Lexicon of the Personalities of the Czech-Slovak Resistance)] (Košice: Východoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1992)
- Peter Švorc and Ľubica Harbuřová, eds., *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatke novodobých dejín 1848–1918; Prvé povojnové voľby v strednej a juhovýchodnej Európe* [First Afterwar Elections in Central and South-Eastern Europe] (Bratislava: Veda SAV, 1998)
- Peter Švorc and Ľubica Harbuřová, eds., *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatke novodobých dejín 1848–1918* [Central European Nations on the Crossroad of Modern History] (Prešov-Bratislava-Wien: Universum, 1999)
- Štefan Šutaj and Ivan Vovkanyč, *Súčasná ruská historiografia o československých dejinách v rokoch 1945–1948* [Contemporary Russian Historiography on the Czechoslovak History in 1945–1948] in *Slovanské štúdie* 1997 [vyd. 1999], č. 1, pp. 11–26.
- Tomáš Tandlich, "Židia v stredovekom Uhorsku," [Jews in Medieval Hungary] in *Historická Revue* 12, 2001, č. 8, pp. 6–7.

- Ján Tibenský, *Poctivá obec budmerická. Starodávna história. Každodenný život slovenskej dediny od najstarších čias do začiatku 18. storočia* [Virtuous Village of Budmerice. Remote History. Everyday Life of Slovak Village from the Earliest Times Until The Beginning of the 18th Century] (Budmerice: Rak, 1998)
- Marián Tkáč and Rudolf Návrat, *Synovia a otcovia* [Sons and Fathers] (Bratislava: Offprint J. Holík, 2000)
- Marián Tkáč, Rudolf Návrat and Ján Valach, *Mali sme bankárov?* [Did We Have Bankers?] (Bratislava: Prúdy, 1996)
- Peter Toma and Dušan Kováč, *Slovakia. From Samo to Dzurinda* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2001)
- Pavol Valachovič, et al., *Územie Slovenska pred príchodom Slovanov Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov. Zv. I.* [The Territory of Slovakia before the Arrival of Slavs. Sources on the History of Slovakia and Slovaks Vol. 1.] (Bratislava: Národné literárne centrum, 1998)
- M. Vároš, *Posledný let generála Štefánika* [The Last Flight of General Štefánik] (Bratislava: Obzor, 1991)
- Branislav Varsík, *Kontinuita medzi veľkomoravskými Slovienmi a stredovekými severouhorskými Slovanmi (Slovákmi)* [Continuity between Great Moravian Slavs and Mediaval Upper Hungarian Slovaks] (Bratislava: Veda, 1994)
- László Vég, ed., *A Bibliotheca Hungarica (cseh)-szlovákiai magyar könyvgyűjteményének bibliográfiája* [The Bibliography of the (Czecho)Slovak Hungarian Book Collection of Bibliotheca] (1918–2000) vols. 1-2 (Dunaszerdahely: Lilium Aurum, 2000)
- František Vnuk, *Dies Ater – Nešťastný deň 29. august 1944 (zborník)* [Dies Ater – Unhappy Day of the 29th August 1944. A Miscellany] (Bratislava: ERPO, 1994)
- František Vnuk, *Mať svoj štát znamená život. Politická biografía Alexandra Macha* [To Have One's Own State Means Life. Political Biography of Alexander Mach] (Bratislava: Odkaz, 1991 (Cleveland: Slovenský ústav, 1987))
- František Vnuk, *Neuveriteľné sprisahanie* [An Unbelievable Conspiracy] (Trenčín: Vydavateľstvo Ivana Štelcera, 1993; Middletown, USA: Jednata P., 1964)
- Martina Winkler, "Alte Bilder und Neue Perspektiven: Aktuelle Arbeiten zur slowakischen Geschichte" in *Bohemia* 42, 2001, pp. 391–404.
- Martina Winkler, "Pohľad zblízka a zďiaľky: Výskum Slovenska v Severnej Amerike a stredoeurópske diskusie" [View from the Close and from the Distance. The Research on Slovakia in Northern America and Central European Discussions] in *Historický časopis* 52, 2, 2004, pp. 247–260.
- V. Zuberec, "Milan Rastislav Štefánik – léta hvězdná a válečná," [Milan Rastislav Štefánik – Years of Stars and Years of War] in *Slovo k historii*, 23, (Praha: Melantrich, 1990)

Jozef Žatkuliak, ed., *November 1989 a Slovensko. Chronológia a dokumenty (1985-1990)* [November 1989 and Slovakia. Chronology and Documents (1985-1990)] (Bratislava: Nadácia Milana Šimečku - Historický ústav SAV, 1999)

Jozef Žatkuliak and Ivan Laluha eds., *Alexander Dubček. Od totality k demokracii. Prejavy, články a rozhovory. Výber 1963-1992* [Alexander Dubček. From Totality to Democracy. Speeches, Articles and Interviews. Selection 1963-1992] (Bratislava: Veda vydavateľstvo SAV, 2002)

Cristina Petrescu and Dragoş Petrescu

Mastering vs. Coming to Terms with the Past: A Critical Analysis of Post-Communist Romanian Historiography

In Romania, fifteen years after the collapse of Communism, the field of historical studies has finally lost its ideological homogeneity. Not unexpectedly, while the ‘old’ traditions of historical writing have survived and are well represented in academia, ‘new’ historiography has begun to gain momentum. Nevertheless, one should be extremely cautious when applying the Western categories of ‘old’ and ‘new’ history to the Romanian post-Communist context.¹ In the Romanian case, ‘old’ history is generally understood as event-centered history (*histoire événementielle*), that is, a facts-oriented, almost exclusively descriptive, archives-based narrative on topics circumscribed to the genre of political history and heavily influenced by the “national Communist” canonical interpretation. As for the ‘new’, it is the purpose of this study to define it, in opposition to the ‘old.’

With regard to the evolution of Romanian historical writings in the post-Communist period three other relevant studies were recently published in English. In order of their publication, the first is by Bogdan Murgescu, a Romanian historian who could be considered part of the new generation of historians that emerged immediately after 1989 and quickly rose to prominence due to the opening of new positions in the formerly closed institutional system. His study, discussing the major trends in the first decade after the fall of Communism, captures well, at a general level, the clash between “old-style nationalist historiography” and the new tendencies in historical writing, as well as institutional developments after 1989. It is, however, a study of small proportions, which did not have the room to go into detail about the reinterpretations of the national Communist canon.² A second study is the result of cooperation between two historians based in Budapest and belonging

to a younger generation, Constantin Iordachi and Balázs Trencsényi. In their analysis of post-Communist historical studies, also restricted to the first decade, the two authors concentrate exclusively on the debates on Romanian nation-building and national ideology. They rightfully identify these debates as being of crucial importance in reshaping historical writing in Romania. As compared with Murgescu, for Iordachi and Trencsényi, the post-1989 changes in the field of historiography are not simply confined to the mere rejection of the ideological and normative national Communist narrative. This transformation, in their view, essentially means bringing historical writing in Romania into accordance with Western methodological standards. This, however, should not consist in the 'internal' evolution of the field of history alone, but also include borrowings from methodologies specific to 'neighboring' or related disciplines. Thus, their study sees the reshaping of historical studies as a result of the dialogue between scholars living abroad and local academics in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences. This dialogue, according to the authors, is not simply replicating the traditional dichotomy between 'Westernizers' and 'autochthonists', but it creates a multitude of positions between these two extremes.³ Finally, the third approach to Romanian post-Communist historiography is from outside the narrow limits of the professional 'historical guild.' It is authored by Smaranda Vultur, who has a background in literary studies and, later, specialized in historical anthropology and oral history. Like Murgescu's article, her work attempts to highlight general trends in historical writing. Vultur's account is based mainly on interviews with and questionnaires filled in by a limited number of historians, selected from among those in the old generation who had not supported the Communist regime and from the new generation. Besides emphasizing the post-1989 general trend against ideologically written history, this study manages to convey a sense of the increasing diversification within the field. At the same time, Vultur's text is dedicated mostly to the emergence of new topics.⁴

Covering post-Communist historical writing during the first one and a half decades, the present analysis aims at detecting the trend towards a 'new' history by analyzing the three major turns in the post-1989 evolution of history as a discipline in Romania. (1) The *de-ideologizing turn* emerged immediately after the 1989 revolution and was supported by those historians who did not consent to the idea of 'na-

tional' history promoted by the Communist regime. Historians argued for observing professional standards and against producing ideologized scholarship, as it was practiced under Communism by regimented court historians who had institutionally dominated the profession. (2) The *de-mythologizing turn* emerged in the mid-1990s, and it provoked the fiercest debates among historians. If the genuine professionals agreed on the necessity of reviving historical studies by removing all ideological ballast, not all were ready to reassess everything that was written under Communism, especially the scholarship on the pre-modern epochs. In other words, the 'collaborators' of the former regime should be denounced and expelled from the guild of professionals, but otherwise the national Communist interpretation should not be rejected inasmuch as it reinforces the traditional, pre-Communist canon. This closely follows the post-1989 attempts at challenging not only the tenets of the hegemonic national Communist narrative, but also the legacies of pre-Communist national historiography. (3) The *re-professionalizing turn* emerged in the late 1990s. The re-professionalizing turn aims not only at reinterpreting the 'national' historiographical canon and challenging the idea that the discipline is essentially objective when practiced by professionals according to the standards established mainly in the 19th century, but also at radically modernizing the discipline. The present analysis discusses individual attempts by older as well as younger historians to structurally change the discipline from within after decades of cultural isolation under Ceaușescu and adapt, both theoretically and methodologically, to the developments that occurred in various Western historiographies after WWII.

We begin by discussing the main trends in Romanian historical studies during the post-war period and by providing a critical analysis of the legacy of communist historiography. The second part – which is the most substantial – covers the period from 1990 to 2004 and concentrates on developments in historiography after the collapse of Communism, including syntheses and monographs on different historical epochs grouped chronologically. Memoirs, diaries, and various other testimonies are discussed in the present study, as they represent valuable sources on the recent past. The last section focuses on the major post-1989 history-related public polemics and discusses in depth the most spectacular of them, namely, the controversy over alternative history textbooks. This part is important in so far as it gives one an idea of

the crisis within the profession as well as the overall perception of history by the general public.

1. HISTORY AND POLITICS: THE LEGACY OF COMMUNIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

Although it may sound paradoxical, it may be argued that in Romania historical studies developed noticeably under the Communist regime. To what extent this development reflected those in Western historiography is another question, however. Obviously, when analyzing the developments in the field of historical studies in Romania in the post-1945 context, one has to take into account the intricate relation between politics and history.⁵ Thus, this part also analyzes the major turns in the political arena, both foreign and domestic, that determined radical changes in the way in which fundamental historical issues were addressed.

With regard to the relation between politics and history writing under Communism, the authors' opinion is that Romanian historiography went through three successive stages.⁶ Symbolically, 1958 and 1974 can be considered as the pivotal years. The first period, 1948-1958, represented a clear break with the traditions of the inter-war Romanian historiography.⁷ Most of the leading inter-war historians, who were also involved in politics, were purged from universities,⁸ and only a few historians who held leftist views and whose writings were influenced by Marxism were recuperated by the new regime.⁹ The dominating personality of this period was Mihail Roller,¹⁰ a historian who pursued university studies in Moscow, returned to Romania after WWII and radically changed the dominant pattern of historical writing. It is beyond the scope of this study to analyze how the main events in Romanian history were successively reinterpreted during this period. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that it became mandatory to emphasize the influence of the Slavs on Romanian language and culture, to exaggerate the importance of the Romanian-Russian relations, and to downplay the Latin character of the Romanian language.¹¹ On the whole, the role of personalities, once a source of patriotic stimulus, was downplayed in favor of emphasizing the social aspects of events instead of the political ones.¹²

Ironically enough, it was not Stalin's death that put an end to this period of ideological constraints, but, in many ways, that of Mihail

Roller.¹³ In fact, the year 1958 had a triple significance for Romanian historiography. Besides the end of Roller's influence in the field of historical studies, in the realm of politics, the year 1958 was marked by an event of paramount importance: the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Romania. From that moment on, the attitude of the Romanian communists toward the Soviet Union changed irreversibly. In addition, it was in 1958 that a Polish historian, Stanisław Schwann, discovered a previously unknown manuscript of Karl Marx containing some annotations on Romanians and their history in the archives of the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam. Such an apparently minor event had a tremendous influence on historical writing, because it allowed the recuperation of the pre-Communist interpretation of history – which emphasized Romanians' struggle against the neighboring adversarial empires, including the Tsarist one – by using arguments provided by Marx himself. The manuscript, edited by historian Andrei Oțetea, was published only in 1964. It was the supreme leader of Romanian communists, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, who understood the value of Marx's manuscript in supporting his new nationalistic course of emancipation from Moscow and ordered its publication, six years after its discovery in Amsterdam.¹⁴

Between 1958 and 1974, Romanian historiography underwent a process of timid and closely watched liberalization. After 1964, a de-Sovietization campaign was launched and gradually many Romanian authors were reintroduced into the historiographic canon.¹⁵ Moreover, some of those still alive were reintegrated into the academic community.¹⁶ In spite of these changes, it may be argued that history benefited less than other disciplines from the relative ideological relaxation and openness to Western culture initiated after 1964. The limits of the present study do not allow a thorough discussion of the successive turns in historical writing that occurred during this period. Generally speaking, the role played by the Slavs, Russians, and Soviets in Romanian history was minimized and subsequently the emphasis was put on the role of the Romanians themselves in events such as the switch of arms of 23 August 1944. As for the more remote periods, the interpretation of various moments came gradually closer to the traditional inter-war canon, especially in the case of the medieval period.¹⁷ It is important to stress that all major syntheses of history elaborated under the Communist regime were published between 1960 and 1971 and,

equally important, that their authors or editors were persons educated in the inter-war period. Among these authors, only two – Andrei Ōtetea and Miron Constantinescu – had adhered to Marxism well before the Communist takeover, while the other two, Constantin Daicoviciu and Constantin C. Giurescu, were among those major historians who, sooner or later, were recuperated by the regime.¹⁸

The third turn in Romanian Communist historiography was anticipated by Ceauşescu's "July 1971 theses," which represented a radical attack against cosmopolitan and pro-Western attitudes in Romanian culture. At the time there were not many who took Ceauşescu's "theses" very seriously. Nevertheless, after the launch of the "July 1971 theses," the regime began to place a strong emphasis on history writing in building the 'socialist' nation. The most important step to be taken next was to provide Party guidelines for the writing of a 'national' history.

Thus, the real turn in historical writing in Communist Romania came in 1974 with the issuance of the founding document of Romanian "national Communism," the Romanian Communist Party's Program. This document opened with a short historical chapter.¹⁹ The interpretation of history as a centuries-old, continuous struggle for social justice and national liberty, single-handedly accomplished by the most advanced segment of the workers' movement, the Communist Party, now became the official version. In fact, the idea of considering the Communist Party as the fulfillment of the social and national aspirations of the Romanian people was by no means new in the Communist repertoire. Gheorghiu-Dej himself had invented it in 1951 for the thirtieth anniversary of the Party, and reiterated it in 1961 at the fortieth anniversary. Ceauşescu took over and stressed the same idea in 1966, at the celebration of the forty-fifth anniversary of founding the Party.²⁰ The new element was that it became a blueprint for all historical writings officially published in Romania. Thus, any possibility of polemical or conflicting interpretations was eliminated. The conception of history as an objective science in which disagreement or conflict of interpretations is always a sign of error was politically imposed. The 38-page concise history of Romania, which was part of the official Party program, became the blueprint for the unique textbook obligatorily used in schools, and, thus, the source of knowledge about the past for every citizen. Four main ideas, which became 'sacred themes' of the national

Communist historiography, emerged from the Romanian Communist Party's Program: (1) the ancient roots of the Romanian people; (2) the continuity of the Romanians on the actual territory of the country from ancient times to the present; (3) the unity of the Romanian people throughout its entire history; and (4) Romanians' continuous struggle for independence.

None of these four themes was brand new. In fact, all these ideas were present from the very institutionalization of history as a scientific discipline in Romania. The first two, the ancient roots and continuity of the Romanians, were developed as a result of controversies with historians from neighboring countries, particularly Hungarians, towards the end of the 19th century. Since state-building and the professionalization of history took place simultaneously in the second half of the 19th century, the third theme, the unity of the Romanian people, was always present in the historical writings of the period, but never became an axiom. The fourth, the incessant struggle for independence, is characteristic of the historiographies of all small countries of East-Central Europe, continually confronted with the much more powerful neighboring empires. As Romania tried to emphasize its independent position within the Communist camp, the centrality of the struggle for independence in the national Communist historiographic canon was, naturally, a reflection of daily politics. In fact, as far as historical studies is concerned, the real problem was that these four themes became the standard, the yardstick of historical interpretation. The obligatory use of these four sacred themes, coupled with a total isolation from methodological developments outside Romania, especially those in the Western world, led to a dramatic de-professionalization of historical writing. To what extent this de-professionalization was surpassed after 1989 is the purpose of the present study to discuss at length.

2. HISTORY WRITING AFTER 1989: THE SLOW PACE OF RENEWAL

Since historical writing was so ideologically controlled under Communism, one of the major consequences of the Revolution of 1989 was that historians found themselves confronted with an unprecedented public interest in discovering the past. As in the rest of the former Soviet bloc, appeals for writing the 'true' history of the country abounded immediately after the collapse of Communism. From inside the profes-

sion, those historians who tried to preserve the professional standards of the discipline against the adversities of the national Communist regime issued a declaration calling for a return to professional honesty in historical writing, rejecting the “shameless and hollow” rhetoric that had distorted historical work under Communism.²¹ This was, in fact, what the signatories of this declaration had done even before 1989 by orienting themselves to more remote periods of the past, where it was easier to by-pass the ideologically driven falsifications. In general, the price paid by such historians under Communism was institutional marginalization. After 1989, most of them regained their deserved places in universities and research institutes, while many historians loyal to the Communist regime were marginalized.

This, however, hardly solved the problem of rewriting history in accordance with professional standards, since the most affected periods were exactly the most recent, covered until 1989 almost exclusively by compromised court historians. The general public also increasingly focused on the history of the 20th century. Having just escaped from the misery imposed by the Ceaușescu regime through an unexpected revolution, the Romanians expressed, first and foremost, their thirst for understanding the nature of the December 1989 events and for learning something about the recent past, so obviously distorted under Communism. Historical works could not be produced overnight; nevertheless, newspapers, magazines, literary journals as well as books published hastily, in cheap, ugly editions, often by tiny provincial publishing houses, mushroomed. Eyewitness accounts, interviews, memoirs, and diaries came out in order to satisfy public demand. Gradually, individuals and groups of former dissidents, political prisoners, and persons who suffered under the Communist regime organized themselves and started to conduct inquiries about the Communist period.²²

Faced with such a growing demand for the ‘true history’ of the country, professional historians tried to cope with it, more or less successfully. Some former medievalists, e.g. Dinu C. Giurescu or Florin Constantiniu, became interested in the Communist period and started to address it systematically. At the same time, the field of contemporary history - generally understood as covering the post-WWI period - had to be practically re-invented after December 1989. Unlike the more remote periods of the past, contemporary history was approached exclusively from an ideological perspective and was therefore distorted

to a very large extent. Consequently, after 1989 everything had to be started anew, beginning with establishing accurate chronologies. In any case, this soon became one of the most dynamic and promising fields of research, not only in terms of scholarly achievements, but also in terms of foreign financial aid. Therefore, most history students specialized in topics related to the recent past. In spite of this clear post-Communist thematic reorientation, the number of academic historical writings on the post-WWI period is still small. Of the great number of volumes that address the Communist period, only few represent original scholarship, while the bulk of the material consists of diaries, memoirs, oral history interviews, and simply collections of documents.

At the same time, the collapse of Communism allowed problems constantly obscured before 1989 to reach the surface. Minority-related problems, above all those connected to the relationship with the Hungarian community,²³ the suffering of the Jews during WWII and the Holocaust, and the recognition of the existing borders required resolute answers not only from politicians, but from historians as well. Apart from practical interests, debates on political issues in which historical arguments were central pushed many historians to take sides. Historians like Gheorghe Buzatu, Mircea Mușat and Ion Ardeleanu engaged in politics by joining the nationalistic Greater Romania Party,²⁴ while others, e.g. Ioan Scurtu, came closer to the type of politics represented by President Ion Iliescu and his party.²⁵ There were also historians who openly supported the coalition of parties that formed, until 1996, the so-called democratic opposition.²⁶ Besides expressing certain political convictions, the option for one camp or another implied different answers to problems like the ones mentioned above. In this respect, the historians who oriented themselves to the Greater Romania Party or the Social Democratic Party proved to be the most attached to the national Communist values and the least internationally competitive. Those in turn who supported the democratic opposition were, in general, respected specialists, who aimed not only at securing a democratic future for their country, but also at reforming their discipline. This split may very well be defined in terms of the classic opposition between autochthonists and Westernizers. In fact, it once again created an opposition, this time in post-Communism, between historians who specialized in the history of the 20th century, the most ideologically distorted period under Communism and those who studied more remote

periods from the past in order to avoid the Party's involvement in their scholarship. This opposition surfaced again with the publication of the first four volumes of the eleven-volume history of the Romanians under the aegis of the Romanian Academy of Sciences.

3. SYNTHESSES OF ROMANIAN HISTORY: NEW AND NOT SO NEW SCHOLARSHIP

Since the Communist Party was so much involved in history writing before 1989, there was little general interest in the production of domestic historians on Romanian history, while works published outside the country were not accessible. After the fall of Communism, lay people and students of history started to look for a fresh and more plausible interpretation of their country's past, while rejecting the Party-contrived version they had been forced to learn at school. In short, the imperative was to provide an ideology-free synthesis of Romanian history, which could constitute a starting point for further, more in-depth research. Since domestic historians could not propose new syntheses of Romanian history immediately after the revolution of 1989, exiled authors, who had had the chance of writing free of ideological control, were recuperated. In this way, the works of Vlad Georgescu (1937–1988), former director of the Romanian desk of Radio Free Europe between 1983 and 1988, gained paramount importance. His synthesis of Romanian history, first published in 1984 by the American-Romanian Academy of Arts and Sciences, was published by Humanitas publishing house in 1992. To this day, it is one of the best works of its kind.²⁷ Further, his book-length essay addressing the relationship between history and politics in Romania during the period 1944–1977 was the first to offer a key to understanding the succession of contradictory historical interpretations under Communism.²⁸

The first domestically produced synthesis was entitled “A sincere history of the Romanian people” – authored by Florin Constantiniu (b. 1933). The title consciously imitates Charles Seignobos' *Histoire sincère de la Nation française*. This book is, in fact, the first attempt to step away from the national-communist idea of Romanian history.²⁹ To put it in a simplified manner, the author proposes an event-centered version of history that tries to reassess crucial episodes of the distant past. He also performs some necessary corrections with regard to

20th-century history. In this respect, the interpretation of WWI is particularly interesting: instead of reading it as the war that fulfilled the “centuries-old dream of the unification of all Romanian principalities,” Constantiniu asserts that it was a war that revealed all the weaknesses of the Old Kingdom and its politicking as well. Thus, Constantiniu’s work should be credited for the “sincere” effort to de-ideologize the teleological narrative promoted in Communist Romania after 1974. In short, the author offered to lay persons the first de-politicized compendium of Romanian history written after 1989.

One should also note that, after 1989, many dilettantes also engaged in writing and publishing about history. Of these authors, Iosif Constantin Drăgan, a controversial figure due to his ambiguous past and his dubious ties with the Ceaușescu regime, is perhaps the most prolific. Drăgan’s synthesis of Romanian history is marked by his obsession with the role of the autochthonous ‘Dacian-Thracian’ element in the formation of the Romanian people, an approach that was increasingly supported by official historiography in the 1980s.³⁰

A concise but quite revolutionary synthesis of Romanian history entitled “A brief history of the Romanians narrated to youngsters” was authored by Neagu Djuvara (b. 1916), a historian who returned from exile after 1989.³¹ His book, the title of which is reminiscent of a famous work by the French historian François Guizot,³² deserves a thorough reading in spite of its shortness. Readable and enjoyable, Djuvara’s work proposes a set of valuable reinterpretations of the most controversial, if not incendiary, issues in Romanian history. His “continuity decalogue,” a set of ten arguments supporting the thesis of the continuity of a Romanized population on the territory of present-day Romania, is of particular interest. Coming from a historian who left Romania in 1944, such a powerful plea against the Hungarian thesis of the late arrival of Romanians in Transylvania might seem surprising. Djuvara’s history illustrates, however, that the theme does not belong to the thin ideological layer introduced by the Communists but is embedded in the 19th-century Romanian historiographical tradition. As we already mentioned, it had been a central problem in Romanian historiography ever since the establishment of history as an academic discipline; the national Communist blueprint of 1974 only dogmatized it.

Another decent and informed synthesis, destined for the general public, was authored by a group that includes Romanian and West-

ern historians. It is telling that the very chapters on the history of the 19th and 20th centuries were written by foreign specialists on Romania: Keith Hitchins and Dennis Deletant.³³ Besides the contribution to this volume, Hitchins' two-volume synthesis of modern Romanian history – which is one of the most accessible and coherent, but not simplistic, works published abroad – was translated from English. This book provides the new generations of history students with an excellent example of a non-politicized narrative on Romanian history.

The efforts to produce or translate histories of the Romanians free of ideological intrusions did not necessarily open the way to a methodological readjustment of the discipline. The 'old' approach towards historical studies has remained predominant up to the present. A decisive shift from the traditional paradigm towards a social science type of research in historical studies has failed to take place. This failure is epitomized by the project of writing a major, eleven-volume synthesis of Romanian history.

It was the Romanian Academy of Sciences that undertook the immensely important collective project of writing the first post-1989 comprehensive work on Romanian history. Actually, this large-scale project was initiated in the mid-1970s,³⁴ but the outcome was never published under Communism. Since such a synthesis was lacking, the project was resumed in the mid-1990s, and the first four volumes were published in 2001.³⁵ This synthesis, however, is 'new' only with regard to its scale in comparison with previous endeavors, but not in its content. Many authors have already publicly stated that this synthesis is based on materials written for the volumes to be published under Communism. Further, historians who had been compelled to participate in the project under Communism but refused to participate again in such a gigantesque collective work during the 1990s (e.g. Șerban Papacostea and Ștefan Andreescu) have publicly accused the editors of the synthesis of borrowing their previous (pre-1989) contributions without asking for permission.³⁶ To conclude, it may be argued that the publication of the first major post-1989 synthesis of Romanian history and the polemics it gave rise to once more confirmed that the re-professionalization of history after Communism is going to be a long and painful process. Liberty of expression and free circulation of information are necessary but not sufficient. Although ideological constraints were lifted after the Revolution of 1989, many of the historians who dominated key institu-

tions continued to write history in a way that had become old-fashioned in the West long before. These views continued to disseminate among the younger generation. A radical break with the past, in the form of a historiographical 'tremor,' occurred with the publication of the works of Lucian Boia, a professor at the University of Bucharest, one of the most 'unorthodox' Romanian historians of the post-1989 period.

4. THE DEMYTHOLOGIZING TURN

When discussing the new trends in historical writing in post-Communist Romania, the first person to be mentioned is undoubtedly Lucian Boia (b. 1944), the charismatic figure of the de-mythologizing current in post-1989 Romanian historiography. His post-Communist writings shook the idea of 'national' history shared by the majority of the academic community in Romania. Ironical and deliberately polemical, *History and myth in Romanian consciousness* remains Boia's capital work.³⁷ As a specialist in the history of historiography, Boia discusses the way in which main hypotheses regarding fundamental issues in Romanian historiography changed throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, from generation to generation, according not only to the advancement of research but also to the political imperatives of the nation-building process. With regard to all previous historical writings in post-Communist Romania, his approach introduced two iconoclastic messages.

First, from a theoretical perspective, Boia's analysis implicitly stresses that the line between fact and fiction is, more often than not, blurred. A thorough reading of his work helps one realize that Boia's main concern is to confront the idea that history could be objectively written. Obviously, this message draws attention to a not-so-new idea that has been acknowledged for a long time by professional historians all over the world, namely that historical writings cannot reflect history 'as it really was.' In Romania, however, it had a tremendous impact. After a period of ideological intrusion into historical writing combined with cultural isolation, many professional historians had returned to the pre-Communist historical traditions, ignoring the developments that had meanwhile shaped the discipline. Thus, Boia's book simply unsteadied the idea that historical narratives, when written according to the scientific standards of the discipline established in the 19th century, could not be but true and consequently unique.

Second, Boia's work was shocking not so much due to its theoretical implications, but because it criticized both the national Communist historical master narrative and the 'national' tradition of historical writing to which many Romanian historians wanted to return after 1989. In a historiographical milieu still lacking in systematic and concerted methodological input from the West, in early post-Communism, the 'national' tradition was generally perceived as the only potential basis for the renewal of historical writing. In Romania, not even the so-called 'critical' school of inter-war historians was ever able to completely overcome the legacy of 19th-century national romanticism, which to a great extent continued to promote the glorious perspective on the national past characteristic of the thinking of the previous generations. In such a professional context, Boia's first and foremost merit was the introduction of a more critical approach into the entirety of national history, not only of its flamboyant version promoted under national Communism. These ideas, although rather implicit than explicit in Boia's books, have been received with great enthusiasm by the new generations of students, happy to discover a fresh message.³⁸ This message quickly became popular, especially among Boia's students at the University of Bucharest.

Boia's work also had a quality that is rare in historical writings: it was so attractively formulated that it created a new fashion, that of deconstructing not only national Communist historiography, but also the entire 'national' tradition. Unfortunately, Boia's message was sometimes misunderstood by its readers and followers who paid no attention to the context in which each narrative about the past developed. Thus, they failed to note the crucial difference between the historical interpretations that, due to the advancement of research, need to be amended or refined, and the conscious distortion of history under Communism. Moreover, ignoring the historical context, some understood Boia's message as conveying the idea that all reconstructions of the past by historians are just imaginary. In this respect, the three volumes of studies mainly by Boia's students at the University of Bucharest (edited by Boia himself) are telling: completely ignoring the complexities of the particular historical contexts, some of the authors did nothing more than ridicule traditional reconstructions of the past.³⁹

In striking contrast to the enthusiasm among the young students in history, the older generations of historians were either silent or ex-

tremely critical with regard to Boia's treatment of the great figures of the past. For instance, many disliked Boia's critique of the cult of the medieval ruler Michael the Brave, who, in 1600, united the three principalities inhabited by Romanians (Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania) under his leadership for one year. (These would become part of the same state, Greater Romania, only after the WWI.) Ever since Nicolae Bălcescu, a historian and a leading 1848 revolutionary from Wallachia, wrote a book entitled "The Romanians under Michael-Voievod the Brave", the condottiere's short-lived union was considered one of the "finest hours" in Romanian history.⁴⁰ As Boia puts it, "through Bălcescu, Michael the Brave decisively and definitively imposed himself as the first founding father of modern Romania."⁴¹ According to the teleological scheme devised by national Communist historiography, that historical moment was clearly an anticipation of the union of 1918, "the centuries-old dream of all Romanians." Some of Boia's critics, outraged that such a hero in the national pantheon did not receive proper treatment, went so far as to insinuate that, since the publication of Boia's book was sponsored by the Soros Foundation, it was certainly intended to serve the cause of Hungarian irredentism.

Boia's work was such a shock to Romanian historiography that, years after the launch of his *History and myth in Romanian consciousness*, his scholarship was still the target of fierce criticism. A very prolific but less innovative Cluj-based historian, Ioan-Aurel Pop (b. 1955), produced the most memorable response on behalf of the historical 'establishment' in Romania. One should keep in mind that in Cluj, historical writing in the Romanian language has always been much more sensitive to problems related to nation-building, in general, and to Romanians' rights in Transylvania, in particular, than at the universities of the Old Kingdom. Pop authored a detailed and polemical book-length review, indeed a chapter-by-chapter assessment of Boia's devastating critique of modern Romanian historical discourses.⁴² His book "History, truth, and myths" epitomizes a line of thinking that is the exact opposite of Boia's. In short, Pop is a historian who strongly believes in 'historical truth.' He thinks that the reconstruction of history "as it really was" is still within the reach of the honest and diligent researcher. His criticism comes from a theoretical position that is no longer tenable: despite his many training stages abroad after 1989, he is simply unaware of the fact that the ideal of scientific objectivity in historical writing has been

abandoned for generations in Western scholarship. Thus, Pop's case is a very telling example that 'old' history can survive even in spite of systematic exposure to academic developments in the West.

5. FROM THE DUSK OF ANTIQUITY TO THE DAWN OF MODERNITY

An important test for post-Communist historiography is the extent to which the late Communist view on history was challenged by more convincing non-ideological reinterpretations. This is not to say that everything written before 1989 was fallacious and should be questioned. Although politics heavily interfered with history during the 1970s and 1980s, one should not assume that all ideas put forward by official historiography were essentially different from pre-Communist ones. Delicate issues, such as the ancient roots and the continuity of the Romanians on the territory north of the River Danube, were major topics with political implications that were taken very seriously by all outstanding Romanian historians. As we already mentioned, from the second half of the 19th century, with the emergence of the first generation of professional historians, ancient roots and continuity were crucial themes in Romanian historiography and were subjects of heated debates with German and Hungarian specialists.⁴³ Theories advanced by historians like the Austrian Robert Rösler and the Hungarian Pál Hunfalvy stated that the local Romanized population withdrew in 274 A. D. within the new confines of the Roman Empire, so that the process of the Romanians' ethno-genesis took place south of the Danube. Romanians' continuity on the territory north of the Danube was denied, as their presence can be proved irrefutably only from the 13th century. Instead of explaining this presence on the basis of the continuity hypothesis, it was assumed that a massive wave of migration from south of the Danube occurred during the 12th and 13th centuries. Obviously, such a view implies that the Hungarians arrived in Transylvania prior to the Romanians. As was already mentioned, this hypothesis was never fully accepted by Romanian historiography. At the end of the 19th century, A. D. Xenopol, a prestigious historian, rejected it completely, locating the Romanians' ethno-genesis north of the Danube.⁴⁴ Others, e.g. Dimitrie Onciul, held that the process of Romanians' ethno-genesis took place north and south of the Danube. Although Onciul agreed that some Romanian population might have come from the

south, he did not question the continuity of the Romanian population north of the Danube.⁴⁵ The thesis of continuity was never rejected by Romanian historiography—not even during the early years of Communism under Mihail Roller—and, as noted, became one of the ‘sacred themes’ of the national Communist interpretation of Romanian history.⁴⁶ Questioning this thesis would go against the entire tradition of Romanian historical writing.

Thus, it is no surprise that the first post-Communist monographs covering the period between the withdrawal of the Roman troops and administration from the territories situated north of the Danube and the early Middle Ages were shaped by the traditional perspective.⁴⁷ Some of these works are either new editions of reputed specialists’ works or books for which the bulk of the research had been carried out before the fall of Communism. In the first category one might include Adolf Armbruster’s “The Romanians’ Romanness” which argued that the Romanians’ awareness of their Roman origins can be traced back to the early medieval period.⁴⁸ In the second category one may place the work of two professors from the University of Bucharest: Ligia Bârzu, a specialist in ancient history and Stelian Brezeanu, an expert in the medieval period. Their book “Origins and continuity of the Romanians: Archaeology and historical tradition” seeks to demonstrate that between the 4th and the 9th centuries a Romanized population existed without interruption north of the Danube.⁴⁹

With regard to the alleged unity of the Romanians over the centuries, the establishment of the first political entities outside the Carpathian basin – Wallachia and Moldavia – represents a historical landmark, due to the involvement of Romanians from Transylvania in these processes. Prominent among the historians who seriously studied the beginnings of the Romanian medieval states is Șerban Papacostea (b. 1928), the first post-Communist director of the Nicolae Iorga Institute of History in Bucharest. His book “The Romanians in the 13th century” discusses the creation of the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia parallel with the evolution of Transylvania in the same century.⁵⁰ For Papacostea, *țările* (countries), entities into which the Romanians organized themselves at the time, were units of political organization corresponding to a particular territory. He argues that, in the 13th century, taking advantage of a favorable external conjuncture—the fall of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade and the confrontation between

the Hungarian Kingdom and the Mongolian Empire—the Romanians succeeded in emancipating themselves politically. This was, in his view, a necessary condition for their survival as an ethnic group. Although his insistence on the solidarity of the Romanians from the two sides of the Carpathians during this remote period might be less convincing, his writings represent one of the finest examples of scholarship preserving what was best in the Romanian pre-Communist tradition: the reconstruction of Romanians' past in the context of 'universal history,' based on a thorough investigation of the widest range of documentary sources.

As far as medieval history is concerned, prominent rulers have always been among the most popular topics in the Romanian historiographical tradition. Works on such rulers continued to appear in post-Communism, either as revised editions of pre-1989 publications or as the outcome of research carried out by younger scholars. From the first category, a volume dedicated to the Wallachian medieval ruler Vlad Țepeș should be mentioned. The book is by Ștefan Andreescu (b. 1947), also from the Nicolae Iorga Institute.⁵¹ Andreescu discusses not only the controversial figure of Vlad Țepeș as a historical character acting in a context generated by the collapse of the Byzantine Empire and the emergence of the Ottoman Empire, but also the cultural phenomenon born in the West in connection with Țepeș's personality. After careful scrutiny of all available sources, including the medieval legends related to the myth of Dracula, the author reiterates, based on evidence, the conclusions once drawn intuitively by A. D. Xenopol. According to these, Vlad Țepeș was an uncommonly cruel ruler – who inspired many 'gothic' stories, beginning with those contemporary to him and ending with those contemporary to us – but also a great ruler who acted in the interest of his country, Wallachia. Thought-provoking and well-researched, the post-1989 version of Andreescu's work contains minor corrections of the version published before 1989. It stands proof to the scholarship of genuine professionals in the field of medieval studies during the Communist period. These historians were able not only to by-pass ideological constraints, but also to build upon a well-established tradition from the pre-Communist period.

Ovidiu Cristea, who belongs to the younger generation of historians at the Nicolae Iorga Institute trained by Papacostea, recently made his debut with a monograph dedicated to another emblematic figure in

Romanian history: Stephen the Great. Contemporary to Vlad Țepeș, Stephen was the ruler of the neighboring Moldavia. He resisted successfully, albeit temporarily, the Turkish expansionism in the second half of the 15th century.⁵² Cristea's fresh perspective on a much researched epoch is based on new archival evidence. He tackles several accounts of the Turkish campaigns of 1484 in Moldavia, written by two contemporaries, both representatives of Venice in Constantinople. Cristea's book breaks with the 'tradition' in that it discusses the Moldavian-Turkish confrontation in its international context, in particular that of the ongoing struggle between Venice and Constantinople for supremacy in the Mediterranean. This perspective goes beyond the narrow 'national' boundaries. Cristea reconsiders the role of Stephen the Great as a potential ally of Venice against a common enemy, fighting the pompous position that Stephen the Great was the defender of the entire Christian world against the pagan Turks.

Whereas Papacostea's book focuses more on Wallachia and the role of Transylvanian Romanians in founding it, a historian from Iași, Ștefan Gorovei (b. 1948) provided a thorough survey of the historical controversies over the creation of the Moldavian state.⁵³ Among his most important contributions to the history of Moldavia is the establishment of a new chronology of its first rulers, based on a careful rereading of all available sources. His book is a fine example of a very technical study aiming at clarifying crucial details rather than reinterpreting the whole.

The formation of the first political entities of Romanians has also preoccupied historians from younger generations. Ovidiu Pecican (b. 1959) from Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj has provided a fresh and revolutionary reading of the existing sources, which are extremely scarce for such remote periods of the past.⁵⁴ The perspective the author provides in his "Historical origins of the Romanian regionalism" on the origins of the state as a form of political organization on the current territory of Romania is not flattering at all. Pecican maintains that all the successive waves of external influences over the course of one thousand years are to be reckoned with. His Transylvanian background makes him perceptive to the problem of the regional diversity characteristic of the remote past but destroyed by the modern homogenizing Romanian state. He argues for addressing the topic in terms of importing models and adapting them to the local conditions. At the same

time, Pecican seriously questions the very use of Western categories when discussing Romanian history, given the time lag between local historical evolution and its Western counterparts: at the time when the Romanians were establishing their first forms of political organization, the West entered the last stage of the Middle Ages.

In this context it should be mentioned that, as compared with Wallachia or Moldavia, Transylvania's place in the history of Romania is much more problematic. Conquered by the Magyars between the 10th and the 13th centuries and integrated into the Hungarian Kingdom, this region became an independent principality under the Ottoman suzerainty in the 16th century, after the establishment of Turkish rule in the Pannonian plain. In 1699, with the advancement of the Austrians towards South-east Europe, it was integrated into the Habsburg Empire, and after the Compromise of 1867 Transylvania got included in the Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy. After the collapse of the Dual Monarchy, not only because of the post-WWI conjuncture and the international peace treaties, but also due to the political will of the Romanian elite from both sides of the Carpathians, it became part of Greater Romania. Therefore, the integration of the pre-1918 history of Transylvania into the history of Romania has been a constant preoccupation of Romanian historians since the inter-war years. The climax was reached during the period of national Communism, when the issue of unity, present in Romanian historiography since A. D. Xenopol, was transformed into a fundamental thesis. Thus, the history of medieval Transylvania was treated even more ideologically than that of the other two principalities.⁵⁵

Nevertheless, works that maintained high standards of professionalism did appear during the 1970s and 1980s. As an example, one should mention the pioneering work of the late historian Radu Popa, who opened the way for the study of the so-called 'Romanian lands.' Popa's major works concentrate on the lands of Maramureş and Haţeg. His "The land of Maramureş in the 14th century" is rendered important by the role this land played in the establishment of the principality of Moldavia. His "At the beginnings of the Romanian Middle Ages: The land of Haţeg" focuses on the turbulent period when the Hungarian state was consolidating its power within the Carpathian basin while, on the other side of the Carpathians, the Romanians were striving to emancipate themselves politically.⁵⁶ The tradition of historical monographs established by Popa was continued after the fall of Communism

by the historian Antal Lukács (b. 1954) from the University of Bucharest. Lukács studied the land of Făgăraș, a region that played a crucial role in the establishment of the principality of Wallachia. His book contains a sort of 'total' history beginning with geographical description, then addressing the social and economic structures and finishing with the political ones.⁵⁷

The legacy of Radu Popa can also be detected in the historiographical interest in the Romanian nobility in Transylvania. This interest is mainly due to the fact that the Romanians as a distinct ethnic group had an inferior status within the social structure of the Hungarian Kingdom. In regions like Maramureș and Hațeg, with their particular geographical positions, surrounded by mountains, at the border between medieval Hungary and the emerging Romanian principalities, nobility structures specific to a feudal-type Romanian society survived longer than in the rest of Transylvania. Popa stressed this aspect by concentrating on the period prior to the centralizing efforts of the Hungarian state.

The study of the Romanian nobility in Transylvania has been continued by Ioan Drăgan, whose book focuses on the immediately following period, that is, the second half of the 15th century. In the author's view, it was during that time that an ethnically defined social group, the Romanian nobility, experienced a period of maximum upward mobility, due to the confrontation between the Hungarian Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire. Approaching his subject from a comparative perspective at the level of Central Europe, the author managed to trace the structure of the Romanian nobility during the period that preceded its complete integration into the Hungarian nobility system.⁵⁸

The fact that Transylvania was an autonomous principality under Ottoman rule from the second half of the 16th century to the end of the 18th century generated a significant difference of perspective between Hungarian and Romanian historiographies. Generally speaking, Hungarian historiography considers the principality of Transylvania as the repository of Hungarian statehood during a period when the rest of the country was under Turkish or Habsburg rule. Romanian historiography in turn holds that during this period the three main 'historical' provinces of present-day Romania enjoyed similar statuses within the Ottoman-dominated world; therefore, the period is perceived as a prelude to the unification of 1918. A fresh perspective on this issue is presented by Cristina Feneșan, whose research is based on new docu-

ments related to the diplomatic treaties between the Porte and Vienna after 1541. The author's innovative perspective is reconstructing the way in which the Ottomans understood the matter. Feneşan's conclusion is quite revolutionary: Transylvania enjoyed a far less autonomous status than both Hungarian and Romanian historiographies have claimed.⁵⁹

The topic of the relationships between the Romanian principalities and the Ottoman Empire was, in the national Communist historiography, directly linked to the alleged unity of the Romanians and their continuous struggle for independence. National Communist historiography incessantly emphasized the fact that Romanians had stood united in front of the common enemy, in spite of the conflicts that often arose between the rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia. Further, it was argued that the two principalities, even when defeated, were never truly integrated into the Ottoman Empire, but retained the political attributes of independence. In the inter-war period, the reputed historian P. P. Panaitescu (1900–1967) raised a question that would become famous: “Why did the Turks fail to conquer the Romanian principalities?” Panaitescu's main answer was that the two principalities were not situated on the main road to Central Europe. Since the Roman and Byzantine times, Panaitescu argued, the main route to the heart of Europe had passed through Belgrade, and that was the route the Ottomans were interested in securing. At the same time, he acknowledged that the Ottoman Empire was interested in the two principalities because of their cereal crops. It was exactly for this reason, Panaitescu claims, that the Romanian principalities were granted a certain degree of independence, since the Turks believed that the locals would be more efficient in managing their own lands.⁶⁰

After 1989, two professors from the University of Bucharest proposed two different answers to the same famous question raised by Panaitescu. Mihai Maxim observed that the Turks had developed their own geographic vision of the continent and argued that it is erroneous to affirm that, from an Ottoman point of view, the two Romanian principalities were not on the direct road to Central Europe. This geographic entity did not even exist for them. As for the Romanian principalities, the Turks considered them to be on a side path, but still on a path to Europe, and therefore worthy of seven military campaigns led by the Sultan himself. To the question of why Wallachia and Moldavia

were not conquered, his answer is rather conservative. Romanians, he argues, waged wars to defend themselves. When overwhelmed by the enemy, they resisted complete integration into the Ottoman Empire by raising undesired complications for the conquering power.⁶¹

A more sophisticated approach is presented by Viorel Panaite. Benefiting from an intimate knowledge of Ottoman legislation, Panaite argues that, from the Turkish perspective, the Romanian principalities were fully integrated into the Ottoman legislative system. According to the Ottoman legislation, the status of the two provinces of the Empire was that of tributary protected principalities. Simply looking at the Turkish maps of the period confirms that the two principalities were, in this status, part of the Empire between 1400 and 1877. It is to Panaite's credit that, for the first time, a piece of Romanian historical writing reckons not only with the self-centered Romanian perspective, but also with that of the 'enemy.'⁶²

Ioan-Aurel Pop (b. 1955), mentioned before in connection with his polemic with Lucian Boia, is one of the most prolific medievalists of the post-Communist period. He received his Ph.D. in 1989 for a dissertation on the Romanian medieval institutions in Transylvania during the 14th-16th centuries. The work was subsequently published in 1991, and the author received a Romanian Academy award for it.⁶³ Since then, Pop published six other volumes, including the critique of Lucian Boia discussed above, and co-authored nine others.⁶⁴ As the titles of his works show, Pop's constant preoccupation is to document the existence of a medieval Romanian nation.⁶⁵ His thesis is based on works by other medievalists like Dimitri Obolensky, mostly published before the 1970s, completely ignoring the literature produced in the field of nationalism studies afterwards.

A crucial event in Romanians' history, Pop argues, was the rule of Michael the Brave. The author maintains that at the moment when the Wallachian prince conquered Transylvania, Romanians from both sides of the Carpathian Mountains, confronted with a common enemy, the Hungarian nobility, experienced a sense of effective solidarity for the first time. On the basis of this Pop concludes that the short union under Michael the Brave opened the transformation of the Romanian medieval nation into a modern one. However, interpreting the events of the year 1600 from a teleological perspective, the author fails to realize that the shape and the ethnic structure of the modern Romanian

nation-state could have been totally different if, for instance, the outcomes of WWI, WWII or the 1989 Revolution had been different.

Finally, from among the historical writings dedicated to the pre-modern period, one should mention the contributions of Bogdan Murgescu (b. 1963), professor at the University of Bucharest. He is among the Romanian historians who, refusing to write event-centered history, engaged in the analysis of structures as proposed by the second generation of the *Annales* school, particularly by Fernand Braudel.⁶⁶ In his “Romanian history – universal history”, he reconnected, as the title suggests, the ‘national’ perspective to the international context. To put it shortly, Murgescu systematically compares “the basic patterns that shaped the history of the Romanian territories” with “evolutions in other parts of Europe or in other parts of the world.”⁶⁷ In short, Murgescu sketched the social-cultural history of the Romanians from the dawn of the Middle Ages to modernity. Since in the case of Romania the written sources are very scarce for the pre-1700 periods, the *Annales* paradigm has been more successfully applied to the 18th and 19th centuries, as shown below.

6. FROM HABSBURGS AND PHANARIOTS TO THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The scholarship discussed in this section covers two centuries. The decision to address these works together was based on the fact that, from the point of view of those who produced them under Communism, they represented a certain window of opportunity. For those who wanted to engage in writing non-event-centered and non-politicized histories, at the same time using primarily written sources, the solution was to concentrate on the 18th century. If someone did not want to pay lip service to the Communist party in their works, the latest period to which he or she could venture was WWI. This is not to say that political and event-centered history is not well-represented. On the contrary, there are historians with truly impressive lists of publications, e.g. Apostol Stan (b. 1933) and Anastasie Iordache (b. 1933).⁶⁸ To be sure, there still are historians—like those mentioned above—who publish new books in the old style.

This section is dedicated to the initiators of new trends in modern history. It must be stressed that the option of an alternative type of history—rejecting the sort promoted by most historians, i.e., political,

event-centered, adopting a perspective from above and based almost exclusively on archival sources—already developed under Communism. It was due to the interest of a few gifted scholars in the *Annales* paradigm, beginning in the period of relative liberalization in the 1960s, that this conception of history gained momentum. (The *Annales* school's approach to historical studies was familiar to prominent historians like Gheorghe Brătianu during the inter-war period; however, after the Communist takeover, it was abandoned in favor of the reinterpretation of Romanian history according to a Marxist scheme.) As shown above, in historiography, the timid ideological relaxation had notable results after 1964 and stretched—due to the efforts of some reputed specialists—beyond the Theses of July 1971 until the beginning of the 1980s. During the 1980s, however, Romania's increasing isolation hampered the efforts to maintain decent professional standards in general. The choice of the *Annales* school as providing a kind of 'alternative' history should be understood against the background of the traditionally stronger cultural links with France. Anglo-American and German scholarship in the field was virtually unknown until 1989. It was only after the collapse of Communism that scholarship from countries other than France began to be translated systematically, while the most important works from the *Annales* school had already appeared in Romanian versions during the 1980s.⁶⁹ The fascination with the *Annales* paradigm, however, was mainly due to the variety of new topics it offered to those who wanted to escape political, event-centered history and to adopt more sophisticated approaches seeking to identify the impersonal forces and long-term processes that influence human beings' behavior over time. In fact, it was the third generation of the *Annales* school and the type of history of mentalities produced by that generation that had a paramount influence on Romanian historiography. Unfortunately, in 1980, when the first debate on the history of mentalities appeared in *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, cultural autarchy was about to reach its peak; the circulation of Western books in Romania and the visits of Romanian specialists to the West continued only haphazardly. Although the *Annales* paradigm was confined, until 1989, to a very small circle of intellectuals, it attracted the most gifted young scholars after 1989.

If one is to associate the development of the history of mentalities in Romania with a single figure, then this figure is the late Alexandru Duțu (1928-1999).⁷⁰ Benefiting from his additional training in litera-

ture and theology, he specialized in the history of the 18th century. This was the remotest period in Romanian history for which enough written sources have survived, allowing the application of the methodology of the *Annales* school. Due to his unusual interdisciplinary training, Duțu proved to be among the very few scholars who were sensitive not only to Western ideas imported into Romanian culture, but also to the local heritage of a Byzantine sort. Before 1989, his interest in the history of mentalities produced several books dedicated to topics like the circulation and reception of books, the evolution of pictorial representations and the development of human models.⁷¹ After the fall of Communism, his most important and, as it happens, last book, addressed the evolution of the idea of Europe in Romanian culture.⁷² Deliberately polemical, questioning the view that, according to the Enlightenment definition that was reinforced by the Cold War, Europe means Western Europe only, Duțu argues that, through the centuries, the political and cultural centers of Europe moved from one region to another. Duțu also states that Europe was always part of the Romanian self-definition. Duțu's own theory of nation-building also contributes to the book's particular interest. His approach is based on two concepts: (1) *organic solidarity*, specific to the private sphere, which includes the family, the parish, voluntary associations and the like; (2) *organized solidarity*, which is promoted by the center of power in search of legitimacy. The latter can be found throughout history, from the stage of elderly councils to the modern state. Contrary to the evolutionary model promoted by modernist-constructivist authors, Duțu holds that the two types of solidarity do not correspond to two different stages—pre-modern and modern—but coexist. The modern state, however, gave priority to organized solidarity. In cases of nation-building such as that of Romania, the transformation of an imperial province into a national state relied primarily on organized solidarity—but not exclusively, as organic solidarity also had a role to play.

Among those who can be considered as Duțu's followers due to their interest in the history of mentalities, Daniel Barbu (b. 1957), professor at the University of Bucharest, Faculty of Political Science, is the first to be mentioned. His book "Letter on sand" also aims at the reconstruction of the mental universe of the 18th-century Romanian elite and, to the extent that sources allow it, of the less visible, common people.⁷³ The author traces such trends as the diminishing

interest in eschatological books, the evolution of the Orthodox iconographical canon, and the decrease in the number of churches financed by boyar families in favor of the rural, 'third estate'-sponsored ones. By this, Barbu succeeds in highlighting the time lag between the crisis of conscience experienced by the elite and the mutation that occurred at the grass roots level. This research in the sphere of mentalities has continued, from a different methodological perspective, in his works in political science.⁷⁴ For instance, in his "Byzance against Byzance", a title which paraphrases that of one of Iorga's best-known books, by re-reading historical texts in search of embedded habits of the mind and patterns of behavior, Barbu presents elements of traditional Romanian political culture.⁷⁵ His efforts at establishing political science on an interdisciplinary basis have been continued to some extent by his younger colleague from the same faculty, Cristian Preda (b. 1966). Some of Preda's writings on major Romanian political thinkers are exploits in political theory and intellectual history.⁷⁶

Of the new generation of historians that moved in the new direction established by Alexandru Duțu at the University of Bucharest, one should mention Laurențiu Vlad (b. 1967), and Ligia Livadă-Cadeschi (b. 1967), both at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest. Vlad's first book was dedicated to the Romanian participation at the World Exhibitions held in Paris in 1867, 1889, 1900, and 1937.⁷⁷ His topic is amazingly contemporary in that it shows the constant preoccupation of Romania's political elite from the mid-19th century onwards with projecting an image that would ensure the country an honorable place among European nations. Originally an inheritor of both Roman and Byzantine traditions, Romania became the most Westernized Balkan country at the turn of the 20th century. On the brink of WWII, the country was convincingly promoted as genuinely European. Vlad's analysis traces not only the image that the Romanian authorities advocated for these exhibitions, but also the French perception of the related official discourse, revealing interesting modifications at both levels. If in the mid-19th century Romania was considered part of a still 'savage' Orient; later on it was seen as a sort of Orient of Europe, finally to be placed in an Eastern Europe increasingly attracted to Western values. As the author shows, these changes meant an increase not only in the self-esteem of the Romanian people, but also in Romania's international status.⁷⁸

Ligia Livadă-Cadeschi has also addressed a topic that is truly novel in Romanian historiography. Her book, also a debut, discusses the emergence of the institutions destined to support the poor in the Romanian principalities.⁷⁹ The period under scrutiny is the 18th century, when both principalities were under the so-called Phanariot regime, and the economic turmoil resulted in a general impoverishment of the population. The author examines how the idea of social assistance, which was implemented in the West emerged in a different form in the radically different Romanian context. While in the West the community had the responsibility to take care of the poor, in the Romanian principalities, social assistance was an overwhelmingly court-sponsored activity. When looking at the way in which poverty is tackled during the transition from Communism, this contrast, underlined by Livadă-Cadeschi, becomes strikingly relevant, since it reveals enduring patterns of thought in the Romanian political culture. Moreover, discussing court-sponsored charity during the Phanariot period, Livadă-Cadeschi proposes a fresh and quite revolutionary perspective on a regime that was described by Communist historiography as alien and predatory.

The evolution of the two Romanian principalities under the Phanariot regime was also approached from a new perspective by Neagu Djuvara, whose concise synthesis of Romanian history we have already discussed. His book “Between Orient and Occident”⁸⁰ follows the way in which Western influences entered the Romanian space, not only in life, style and fashion, but also in the realm of political ideas such as the abolition of slavery. In this respect, Djuvara is a follower of Pompiliu Eliade, a historian who in 1898, Paris, published a book on French influences on the Romanian principalities. Eliade was the first to argue that, apart from diplomats and emigrants of French origin, the Phanariot princes—Greeks by origin but educated to be diplomats, thus possessing a solid knowledge of Western languages—introduced French culture in the Romanian principalities. It is worth noting that Pompiliu Eliade’s book, which was, in fact, his doctoral dissertation at Sorbonne, was translated into Romanian only in 1982, with a foreword by Alexandru Duțu.⁸¹

Djuvara does not close his investigation at the end of the Phanariot period but proceeds to the 1848 Revolution and proposes a fresh interpretation. Eliade presented a black-and-white picture: the import of

Western models was a radical project that brought "civilization" into the previously "primitive" Romanian principalities. Without disagreeing in substance, Djuvara argues that this was in fact a gradual process that resulted from the influence of an extremely active, albeit small, local elite. This elite, which traveled abroad and completed its education in the West, adopted new ideas and, within two generations, took over power and imposed these ideas in the spheres of both culture and politics.

From among other representatives of new trends in historical writing, one should also mention Mirela Luminița-Murgescu (b. 1964), from the Faculty of History, University of Bucharest. Her book, dedicated to history textbooks, is the first of its kind in Romania. It addresses the transformations that occurred in curricula during a crucial period of state- and nation-building, from 1831 to 1878. The author examines the way in which political changes influenced the construction of national identity by analyzing the importance attached to various personalities and historical events. As one can tell from the very title of her book, the author assumes that national identity is not perennial, but constructed and subject to alteration. This approach is quite novel in the Romanian context.⁸²

Ironically, in Romania, gender studies has best been promoted by a male historian, Alin Ciupală (b. 1968), also from the Faculty of History, University of Bucharest. His book "The Woman in the Romanian society of the 19th century" follows the sinuous path of female emancipation, which, the author argues, mirrored the process of establishing the modern Romanian state.⁸³ Ciupală shows that the main avenue of women's access to the public sphere, previously reserved for men, was education and not enfranchisement, which would become a debated issue only later, in the inter-war period. This is a predictable delay in comparison with similar trends in Western countries. Moreover, Romanian women received their right to higher education from the liberals. This measure was part of the process of Westernizing Romanian society; thus, women did not have to fight for their emancipation. As Ciupală argues, this is not to say that women were incapable of organizing themselves once the way was opened: the Romanian feminist societies established in the 19th century were very active NGOs *avant la lettre*.

New trends in historical writing emerged in Iași as well. Since in Iași historical studies has a long and respected tradition, the post-1989

period was marked, as in the other traditional centers of academic excellence in historiography, by a confrontation between old and new trends in history writing. As shown above, the degree of professionalism displayed by the new generation heavily depended on 'alternative' personalities, as it were, whose reputations were primarily based on academic merit. If we are to name one such a personality in Iași, then it is Alexandru Zub (b. 1934), a major cultural historian and reputed specialist in Romanian historiography. A former political prisoner who started his career later than normal, Zub is one of the most prolific Romanian historians.⁸⁴ After the fall of Communism, he published an impressive number of volumes, which either continue his previous research in the fields of historiography and cultural history or illustrate his involvement in the public sphere.⁸⁵

Beyond doing his own work, Zub has a remarkable capacity to stimulate the new generation at the local level. Before the fall of Communism, he headed an 'alternative' historical circle in Iași with the membership of young scholars trained in various fields, who developed a special sort of interdisciplinarity that allowed them to pursue successful scholarly paths. Internationally competitive volumes, published in the late 1980s, bear witness to the activity of this circle.⁸⁶ Among the historians who emerged from it is Sorin Antohi (b. 1957), whose work "Utopica: Studies in the Social Imaginary" remained a 'drawer book' up to the fall of Communism.⁸⁷ After 1989, in his capacity as director of the A. D. Xenopol History Institute, Zub launched a series of volumes in which many contributions are by members of the new generation who had not yet published their first volumes. Many of these young authors are interested in addressing non-event-centered topics, in order to overcome the predominant interest in political history and to revitalize the methodological side of the profession, so badly neglected by most historians. It is also worth mentioning that in Iași, unlike in any other university center, there is a permanent scholarly interest in the study of Bessarabia.⁸⁸ Under Communism, this topic was generally avoided and sometimes used for political purposes.⁸⁹ The volume "Bessarabia: Dilemmas of identity" comprises various studies that, in general, aim at transgressing the traditional Soviet and Romanian perspectives. While the former constantly tried to document the existence of a separate Moldovan identity that is distinct from the Romanian, the latter—even under Communism, when references were either avoided

or implicit—always took for granted Romania's historical rights to that region.⁹⁰

In addition to the publications of the A. D. Xenopol Institute, the University of Iași has its own series of publications. From among these works, authored by historians from a new generation, the book of Alexandru-Florin Platon, the current dean of the Faculty of History of "Al. I. Cuza" University of Iași, is worth mentioning for several reasons. First, the author addresses his topic, the formation of the bourgeoisie in the Romanian principalities,⁹¹ from an interdisciplinary perspective. Sensitive to sociological interpretations, he surpasses the purely political and event-centered type of history, still produced on a massive scale in Romania. Second, unlike many historians in Romania, Platon dedicates a large part of his book to concepts and methods employed by similar works concerned with other European countries. Aware of this literature, he has developed a sort of 'asymmetrical comparison' identifying the similarities between the Romanian principalities, especially Moldavia, and other East-European countries as well as what differentiates them from the West. Finally, Platon is concerned to overcome the classic Marxist interpretation that views the decline of nobility and the emergence of bourgeoisie as two complementary processes. The author stresses the continuities between the two social groups and argues that the bourgeoisie emerged – not entirely, but to a large extent – through the metamorphosis of a significant boyar stratum.

In the same series, another historian from the new generation, Mihai Cojocaru, published a book on the union of the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1859. This event, in fact, represents the foundation of the modern Romanian state.⁹² The author analyzes all the interest groups that acted in the two principalities at the time, still under Ottoman sovereignty. Contrary to the national Communist interpretation of the 1859 union, the author does not imply that opinions against the union were only those of the most reactionary aristocracy or simply did not exist. Cojocaru discusses the context in which the so-called national political group succeeded in imposing its view by the end of the troubled period between the 1856 Peace Congress in Paris and January 1859, when the same person was elected prince in both principalities. The author analyzes the pro-union propaganda disseminated both abroad and within the two principalities among various interest groups from the elite as well as among other social strata. This

way, he explicitly avoids not only the national Communist interpretation, but also that from the earlier years of Communism, which regarded the union as exclusively the expression of the “class interests of the bourgeoisie.”⁹³

Finally, in Cluj, the main center of historical studies in Transylvania, historians developed a specific research agenda, generally confined to the controversial past of this region. Traditionally, in the Romanian department of Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj, national identity and nation-building have been intensely studied since the inter-war period. Naturally, the never-ending debates between Romanian and Hungarian historians over the history of Transylvania heavily influenced this interest.

Sorin Mitu (b. 1965) provides a different perspective on the topic of Romanians’ national identity. Specialized in the modern period, Mitu is among the few historians in Romania whose theoretical perspective on nation and national identity is modernist-constructivist. He also coordinated the writing of the most controversial alternative history textbook, which will be discussed at length in the section dedicated to major history-related controversies during the post-1989 period. Mitu’s major work is “The Genesis of National Identity of the Romanians in Transylvania,” which, concentrating on the period between 1770 and 1850, rejects the primordialist approach.⁹⁴ Focusing on the intellectual discourses in this period which followed the moment when a great number of Romanians accepted the Union with Rome in order to receive more political rights, up to the turmoil of the revolution of 1848, Mitu highlights the various competing identity formulas of the time. He acknowledges the role of the elite in creating and imposing the variant that featured the unity of language, which merged the two Romanian religious communities—the Orthodox and the Greek-Catholic—in Transylvania, transforming a traditional type of identity into a modern one. Under the influence of the *Annales* paradigm, Mitu also argues that the Romanians did not develop a self-image by departing from social realities, but in contrast to others’—mainly negative—perceptions of them.

Among the historians who applied the history of mentalities paradigm in Cluj, the most prominent is Toader Nicoară (b. 1956), the current dean of the Faculty of History at Babeş-Bolyai University. Nicoară wrote a volume that focuses on Transylvania between its in-

corporation into the Habsburg Empire and the Napoleonic wars, which decisively transformed this Empire—in short, on the long 18th century.⁹⁵ Nicoară's work addresses the period when Transylvanians were gradually integrated into the Western type of civilization and were forced to face the challenges of modernity. The first part of the book traces this influence on everyday life, religious attitudes, and popular world-views, while the second part concentrates on the self-image of the Romanians as well as their image in the eyes of other ethnic communities, reconstructing the social and political imagery of the time.

Finally, with regard to the new tendencies in historical writing emerging in Cluj, the work of Lucian Nastașă (b. 1957) also needs to be mentioned. In comparison with all other Romanian historians, he is the most sociologically-oriented. Although his intellectual interests range from the study of various ethnic groups in his native country to historiography,⁹⁶ Nastașă's most provocative work is dedicated to the elite change in the historical profession at the turn of the century in Romania.⁹⁷ Following the model proposed by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, the author focuses on the strategies employed by the so-called 'critical school,' the generation of Nicolae Iorga, Dimitrie Onciul, and Ioan Bogdan, in order to establish their control over the social space demarcated by their profession. Temporary alliances, skillfully orchestrated polemics, strategies of marrying into well-to-do families, all were destined to help the new generation acquire the power, prestige, and wealth necessary to take over the dominant institutional positions in the field. Nastașă extended this analysis to other academic spaces in a second book.⁹⁸ His endeavors strengthened the demand for interdisciplinarity in historical studies in the research of the beginnings and consolidation of the modern Romanian state—by and large, the most dynamic part of post-Communist historiography in this country. Unfortunately, the case of research on what is still known as "Greater Romania," i.e., post-Trianon and pre-Communist Romania, is different.

7. DEBATES ON GREATER ROMANIA

As was already stated, under Communism, most of the history graduates who opted for a professional career based on academic accomplishments found refuge in distant periods of the past. This was a territory into which only the best could venture, since solid knowledge of

classical languages and other history-related disciplines were necessary conditions of producing scholarship which met the required standards. Before 1989, it was generally believed that the closer the topic was to the present, the less the historian had to learn. For a researcher specialized in the 20th century, knowledge of Romanian was enough to read documents and produce a narrative based upon them, since Western literature was scarce in Communist Romania and travel for academic purposes was severely restricted. Thus, the professional standards and cultural horizon of the majority of these historians did not match those of their colleagues researching the remote past. After the fall of Communism, however, the interest in the recent past started to grow, the awareness of the necessity of keeping up with international developments within the discipline increased, and thus, with new generations entering the field, the situation began to change.

The low professional standards of the majority of the historians specialized in the 20th century is shown by the kinds of books they published after 1989. A significant part of their production consists of publications of sources and different compilations, such as collections of documents, chronologies, and dictionaries of personalities.⁹⁹ Obviously, reference works are important tools and need to be produced, but they hardly represent the peak of a historian's *oeuvre*. Lacking a new interpretative framework, historians who had studied this period before the collapse of Communism proved to be unable to use the information collected from primary sources for writing plausible and non-ideological narratives. Their works have remained close to the type of history promoted under Communism, with the ideological "tails" (those parts of the introduction and the conclusion in which the author paid lip service to the Party) removed but the fundamental approaches otherwise unchanged.

Further, it can be noticed that many of the established historians who had written detailed event-centered histories of the period in which they specialized, published different parts of these histories after 1989, slightly refurbished and enlarged. This explains the appreciable number of 'monographs' on similar, if not identical, topics by the same author. Typical examples are the numerous works published by Ioan Scurtu (b. 1940), a historian specialized in the political parties of the inter-war period. Scurtu is former director of the National Archives, professor at the University of Bucharest and currently director of the Nicolae Ior-

ga Institute. From the master narrative on the history of the National Peasant Party, he has managed to publish a large number of books that reiterate the same information.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, most of these volumes are only cosmeticized versions of pre-1989 writings. A good example is the book co-authored with his colleague from the University of Bucharest, Ion Bulei, which appeared in 1990 under the title "Democracy to the Romanians, 1866-1938."¹⁰¹ The volume analyzes the evolution of political parties from their emergence to their dissolution with the establishment of royal dictatorship. The focus of the book is on the conflicts of interests which led to a huge number of re-groupings, splits, and mergers, making the very idea of political doctrines meaningless in the Romanian political landscape. The work must have been prepared for publication before 1989, when such topics served well to demonstrate the alleged 'decay' of the pre-Communist Romanian political elite. The use of obsolete concepts such as "bourgeois parties" and the ardent, manifest republicanism of the authors can help the reader discover the manipulation. One must not think, however, that the post-Communist bookstores were filled with such 'productions' only.

As was already mentioned, the problem with inter-war history is that many topics approached from an ideological viewpoint before 1989 are still waiting for convincing re-interpretations. In some cases the first attempts at opening debates on such topics were made by specialists from other fields such as cultural studies, political science, cultural anthropology, or sociology. These specialists had lived abroad or spent long periods of time in the West. A good example is the literary critic Sorin Alexandrescu, former professor at the University of Amsterdam, who up to this day remains the only person who tried to provide a more balanced interpretation of the union of 1918.¹⁰² According to the national-communist canon, the creation of Greater Romania represented the fulfillment of the centuries-old dream of all Romanians, expressed by the large masses gathered in Khishinev, Czernowitz, and Alba Iulia in the aftermath of WWI. Looking comparatively at political activity in all the regions that were to become parts of Greater Romania, Alexandrescu moves the accent from the collective action of the masses to that of the elites. He explains the union as a result of the sustained activity of political leaders from the Old Kingdom and of those from the Romanian-inhabited regions of the neighboring collapsing empires who skillfully made use of a favorable international context

and created Greater Romania. At the same time, Alexandrescu challenges Irina Livezeanu's approach to the creation of Greater Romania. In her book *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania*, Livezeanu speaks about "annexations" of territories.¹⁰³ It is legitimate to speak of a union, Alexandrescu argues, since the representatives of Bessarabia, Bukovina, and Transylvania in some way or another freely expressed their will to join the Old Kingdom. It is very telling that, apart from Alexandrescu, local historians have not yet produced a monograph based on a more sophisticated interpretation of the crucial topic of the establishment of Greater Romania.¹⁰⁴

8. INTERPRETATIONS OF ROMANIAN FASCISM

Among all subjects, fascism in Romania was the most severely restricted and policed before 1989; only those researchers whom the Party fully trusted could publish on this subject.¹⁰⁵ According to the Communist interpretation, the Iron Guard was a criminal organization which rose to prominence in politics due to the weakness of the political establishment. After the collapse of Communism, however, motivated by the idea of recuperating the 'true' history of the country, many publishing houses started to release histories of the fascist movement written by exiled former members of the Iron Guard.¹⁰⁶ Such discourses generally claim that Corneliu Zelea Codreanu, the charismatic first leader of the movement, had nothing to do with the political murders carried out during his leadership. It was his successor, Horia Sima—the argument continues—who was responsible for the abominable killings perpetrated during the time of his being in power, beginning with the assassination of historian Nicolae Iorga in 1940. Thus, it was Sima who compromised the original noble mission of the movement as envisaged by Codreanu. Besides such justificatory writings published earlier by emigré Romanian legionnaires, former Iron Guard members and followers still living in Romania started to publish their own apologetic works in the hope of resurrecting the movement. Their main propagandistic argument is that the Iron Guard, in its purest form, i.e., under the leadership of Codreanu, was never in power, so it never had the chance to fulfill its ideals.¹⁰⁷

With regard to the history of the Iron Guard, the historiographical picture became more balanced with the translations of two important

works written before 1989 by foreign scholars interested in comparing Romanian Fascism with other European varieties.¹⁰⁸ At the same time, local replicas of the attempts at promoting an idealized image of the Iron Guard emerged as well. A former researcher at the Party's Institute of History, Constantin Petculescu, maintains, based on archival material mostly from the Archives of the Romanian Intelligence Service (S.R.I.), that there is basically no crucial distinction between the period of Codreanu and that of Horia Sima. The author notes that it was Codreanu himself who directly ordered the assassinations carried out under his leadership, instituting the practice of political murders in Romanian political culture. Thus, Petculescu argues, the numerous political murders carried out in the second period of the Iron Guard were just the direct consequence of the policy initiated by Codreanu.

One can notice, however, that Petculescu's interpretation is tributary to the Communist explanation of Romanian Fascism, especially his emphasis on the fact that the movement did not enjoy much support from the population. Such claims rely on the fact that the highest percentage ever achieved by the Iron Guard was only 15%, in the 1937 elections. Petculescu holds that the Iron Guard extended its influence due to the direct support or the indifference of the inter-war political elite.¹⁰⁹ In fact, the most controversial issue related to the Iron Guard's political career is the support of prominent intellectuals. Until today, the only relevant comprehensive monograph written by a local author is the work of the late literary critic Zigu Ornea (1930–2001). His "The 1930s: The Romanian extreme right"¹¹⁰ is a well-documented and insightful study, which covers all the significant publications of the period. It offers a better picture of the period than some monographs written by 'outsiders,' which concentrated only on a few—at the time young and rather insignificant, but later world-famous—intellectuals.

9. CONTROVERSIES OVER THE HOLOCAUST IN ROMANIA

With regard to the inter-war period, other topics that had been taboo under Communism surfaced after 1989, due to the contributions of specialists in emigration. The most controversial among these topics is the Romanian Holocaust. Under Communism, the suffering of the Jews and the Holocaust, in spite of the regime's careful strategy to formally avoid any form of anti-Semitism, was treated ambiguously.¹¹¹

Works on the subject were published only in the 1970s. These books, however, played down the number of victims and argued that the Romanian authorities should not be blamed for the atrocities committed against the Romanian Jews.¹¹² A central argument in favor of such an interpretation was that from Romania no train left with Jews for Nazi extermination camps. In other words, it was argued that the Antonescu regime did not consent to the “final solution”.¹¹³ This interpretation paved the way for the gradual recuperation of the figure of Antonescu by the Ceaușescu regime through the voice of the controversial personality of the Italian-based Iosif Constantin Drăgan. This continued well after the fall of Communism, through books authored or edited by the same Drăgan and other Romanian historians.¹¹⁴

Before 1989, topics such as the Holocaust and the participation of the local population in the persecution of Jews were avoided in all former Communist states. Thus, it is no wonder that after the collapse of the old regime such topics stirred heated debate when survivors of the Holocaust requested that this terrible episode be properly addressed. Analysts who followed these controversies observed that, in all of East-Central Europe, the general perspective on the Holocaust ranged from total negation to trivialization by comparison with the Gulag.¹¹⁵ Indeed, since these countries had just emerged from Communism, most of their inhabitants wanted to learn first about the sufferings of the “majority” in Stalinist camps and not about what was for them the ordeal of a minority. Others acknowledged the legitimacy of the Jewish pressure, but held that any such endeavor must take into account not only the atrocities committed in the name of race, but also those in the name of class. In spite of the clash between these two kinds of memories, at least in the case of Romania, much was accomplished in the direction of institutionalizing the debate on this tragic historical episode, also due to external diplomatic pressure. The debate first surfaced in the public sphere, promoted by non-historians, and only then did it take root in professional circles as well. Nevertheless, with the opening of the archives, historical research on the Holocaust gradually fixed the boundaries of the debate.

As in the case of other Party-controlled topics, the first post-1989 book on the problem of the suffering of the Jews in Romania during WWII was written by an American-based author born in Romania, Radu Ioanid.¹¹⁶ Relying on documents from the U.S. Holocaust Me-

morial Museum, he illustrates the way in which policies concerning the Romanian Jewry varied tremendously from one historical region to another. In Wallachia, Moldavia, and the part of Transylvania under Romanian administration, the number of victims was smaller, as there were pogroms in these territories but practically no deportations. In Bessarabia and Bukovina, the volume of atrocities committed against Jews was much more significant and the number of casualties was considerable. The highest number of victims, however, was registered in Transnistria, the Ukrainian territory occupied by the Romanians in 1941, where most of the Jews were deported. Ioanid avoids the mistake committed by many previous authors who blame the Romanian government for the Jewish victims in Northern Transylvania, which was under Hungarian administration between 1940 and 1944.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, he underlines the fact that Romania ranks second after Germany in terms of participation in the Holocaust: this country, unlike Hungary, for instance, where the Holocaust was organized by the Germans, organized its own process of extermination. Although Ioanid does not clearly state this, his interpretation of the Romanian case can be considered to be intentionalist. In his view, it was Marshal Antonescu and his closest collaborators who, from the very beginning of the war, decided about the fate of the Romanian Jews. Moreover, Ioanid argues, for once, Romania managed to get ahead of the West since, as he puts it, its Holocaust was initiated before the German one. Acknowledging that no Jews were sent to Nazi concentration camps from Romania, Ioanid explains Antonescu's decision to put an end to the deportation of Romanian Jews by his realization of the shift in the course of the war after the battle of Stalingrad.

From among the domestic interpretations of the Romanian government's policies towards the Jewish population, Dinu C. Giurescu's book "Romania during the Second World War" offers a plausible account.¹¹⁸ The volume, which focuses on WWII in Romania, contains a large chapter on the fate of the Romanian Jews between 1940 and 1944. Giurescu (b. 1927) proposes a perspective on the suffering of the Jews in Romania that is different from Ioanid's, based on his intimate knowledge of Romanian history in general and of the historical context of WWII in particular. When analyzing the anti-Semitic laws of 1940, Giurescu also attempts to reconstruct both the external and internal contexts in which those laws were issued. The Romanian political elite,

Giurescu argues, was anxious to gain the benevolence of Nazi Germany as long as Romania's Western allies, France and England, failed to provide any guaranties. As a consequence, Romanian authorities adopted laws similar to the Nuremberg legislation on Jews. Giurescu also touches upon an intricate and less documented issue, namely, the inimical acts by a part of the Jewish population against the disarmed Romanian army that was retreating from Bessarabia and Bukovina, the territories lost to the Soviet Union after the ultimatum of June 1940.

The author extensively discusses the atrocities committed by the Romanian military against the Jewish population in Bessarabia, Bukovina, and especially in Transnistria. Like Ioanid, Giurescu also demonstrates that the policy of the regime towards the Jews differed from one region to another. However, the author states that the decision to stop the deportation of the Jews from the Old Kingdom, as well as from the part of Transylvania under Romanian administration, to the Nazi concentration camps was made five weeks before the beginning of the Soviet counter-offensive at Stalingrad. This argument contradicts the idea supported by Ioanid that it was Romanian opportunism during the war that saved the Romanian Jews. In spite of these differences in interpreting the causes that led to the atrocities, both authors acknowledge their existence. More and more Romanians have come to agree that it is necessary to uncover the facts, no matter how embarrassing they might be, and the suffering of the Jews in Romania has become a serious object of inquiry.

With this, the discussion of the responsibility of the Romanian authorities for the suffering of Jews during WWII has entered a different stage. With the opening of new archives in the region, the picture of the period became gloomier. The controversy over the Romanian Holocaust became more and more centered on the number of victims. In his above-mentioned book, based on documents from Romanian, Moldavian, and Ukrainian archives, Ioanid estimates that around 250,000 Romanian Jews died during WWII.¹¹⁹ Another researcher, Jean Ancel (from Yad Vashem), who had the opportunity to do research on the Romanian Holocaust in Ukrainian and Russian archives as well, raised the total death toll of Jews to 410,000, of whom 170,000 were local Jews from Transnistria or Odessa.¹²⁰ Thus, Ancel uncovers a previously overlooked dimension of the Romanian Holocaust: the destruction of the 'non-Romanian' Jews from the temporarily occupied territories

during WWII. Considering this, Romania is the country that had the highest contribution to the Holocaust of all Nazi allies.

The extent to which this horror was generated by Romanian anti-Semitism continues to be a subject of controversy. At a more general level, one of the most controversial issues surfacing after the decades of Communist homogenization was the place non-Romanian communities should have in Romanian history. It was only because of the tragic turn during WWII in relation to Nazism that the fate of the Jews living in Romania differed from that of all the other ethnic groups. Otherwise, it is true of all minorities in Greater Romania that they could hardly find a place, not only in a state in the process of modernization that is unable to cope with diversity, but also in its history.

10. ETHNIC MINORITIES IN ROMANIA: THEIR HISTORY AND THEIR RIGHTS

After WWI, by incorporating new territories, Romania was suddenly transformed from an ethnically almost homogenous state into one in which ethnic minorities made up 25% of the population. Since then, the place that non-Romanians should occupy in a history of Romania has remained an open question. After the collapse of Communism, the first issues that monopolized the public sphere, even before the Holocaust, were related to national identity formation and minority rights. The earlier works concentrating on these topics were authored by NGO activists such as Gabriel Andreescu, Smaranda Enache, and Renate Weber.¹²¹ Generally, however, such contributions fail to take an historical perspective. The historians who have addressed the topic mainly came from two ‘camps.’ The first, nationalistic ‘camp’ concentrated on issues such as Hungarian revisionism in the inter-war period and Hungarian claims over Transylvania.¹²² The second ‘camp,’ representing a younger, Western-educated generation of historians, has provided modern, balanced approaches to the subject. In this respect, the above-mentioned work by Sorin Mitu, “The Genesis of National Identity among the Transylvanian Romanians”,¹²³ is especially important. One should also mention the joint project of young Romanian and Hungarian scholars from Central European University in Budapest, which materialized in an edited volume on issues of nation-building and modern identity formation in Romania and Hungary.¹²⁴ With

regard to the German minority in Romania, it is worth mentioning Thomas Năgler's book "Romanians and Saxons until 1848".¹²⁵ A silent minority in Romanian history, the Roma, started to be studied systematically after 1989, and a history of the Roma community in Romania, authored by Viorel Achim, was published in 1998.¹²⁶ Since many Western foundations are sponsoring research on minority-related issues, it is expected that the number of monographs of this type will increase in the years to come.¹²⁷

11. APPROACHES TO THE COMMUNIST PAST

Quite naturally, the breakdown of the Communist regime was followed by heated debates concerning the role of archives and archivists in supporting the widely claimed need for writing the "true" history of Romania. Furthermore, as the independent media showed repeatedly in the early 1990s, large quantities of important documents concerning the Communist past (especially documents related to the activity of the former secret police, the *Securitate*) were destroyed or simply disappeared. Thus, the reform-oriented segments of society pressed for the issuance of modern regulations to govern not only the reorganization and development of archives, but also the difficult problems related to the access to official archives. Finally, the Law of National Archives was adopted in March 1996.

As already mentioned, numerous organizations and individuals have questioned the usefulness of closure periods as long as those stipulated by the 1996 law. Many historians specializing in recent history requested the reduction of these periods, including the general closure period of thirty years, arguing that the opening of documents related to the Communist period is crucial for coming to terms with a troubled past. However, until now, nothing was modified, although, between 1996 and 2000, the country was governed by a Western-oriented coalition, supported by a large majority of the critical intellectuals, among whom historians featured prominently.

The post-1989 period was characterized by a massive turn in historical studies. As was already stated, the interest of students and the general public turned to contemporary or recent history, while the ancient, medieval, and early-modern periods rapidly lost ground. Nevertheless, the development of recent history studies proved more difficult

than it had been thought previously. The reasons are, basically, two-fold. The first reason is the poor professional training of those (actually party activists) who colonized the field of post-WWII history during the Communist period. Such historians were 'specialists' in the official history of the Romanian Communist Party (Vlad Georgescu called them *culturniks*) and were obsessed with primitive-positivistic, event-centered political history. As was discussed, a consequence of the intrusion of the Party in the field of post-WWII history was that the most gifted historians who wanted to do their job honestly moved to less "ideological" periods. After the collapse of the regime in December 1989, it turned out that there were practically no university professors who could provide the new generation specializing in this historical period with modern, professional training. Thus, many of those who saw the need to place the discipline of recent history on a sound basis were former medievalists, e.g. Dinu C. Giurescu, Florin Constantiniu and, by the end of the 1990s, Andrei Pippidi, who shifted to contemporary studies. In addition, Romanian Communism has been studied not only by historians, but also by political scientists.¹²⁸ However, the main problem is that, while the historiographic canon in the fields of ancient, medieval, and modern history up WWI was established by outstanding scholars like A. D. Xenopol, Nicolae Iorga, Vasile Pârvan, and Constantin C. Giurescu, the historiographic canon in the field of recent history has yet to be established. Moreover, research on any topic related to the recent past must begin by establishing an accurate chronology, since the most comprehensive chronology produced under the Communist regime, edited by Constantin C. Giurescu and published in 1972,¹²⁹ is of little use for the post-war period.¹³⁰ This, obviously, puts additional strain on the development of the discipline.

One of the main obstacles to establishing the field of history on a professional basis was the reluctance of the post-Communist regimes to open the archives for historical research. This is true of both the archives of the former Romanian Communist Party (RCP) and those of the former secret police, the *Securitate*. Moreover, neither the Law of National Archives (Law no. 16 of 2 April 1996), nor the law concerning the access to one's *Securitate* file (Law no. 187 of 7 December 1999), makes things easier as far as historical research is concerned.

In Romania, as in other former communist countries of East-Central Europe, access to official records from the communist period, such

as those of the former Communist party or the secret police, is crucial not only to historians interested in the recent past, but also for the process of national reconciliation. In this respect, the 1996 law does not state very clearly the procedure of defining which documents endanger the national security or the citizens' rights and liberties. Such an ambiguous formulation facilitates the abuse of power and contributes to the making of arbitrary decisions regarding the access to some documents. Furthermore, if one compares the closure periods stipulated by the Romanian Law of National Archives with those recommended by the International Council on Archives, one easily observes that, in a majority of cases, the Romanian law uses either the longest terms in the range or exceeds them. For instance, while the Council recommends no more than fifty years closure for documents involving the state interests, the Romanian law establishes that the records containing information regarding the national security must be withheld for one hundred years. Similarly, in the case of documents containing data about individuals' private life, the council recommends maximum seventy years from the file ending, whereas the Romanian law establishes a closure period of seventy-five years.

Surprisingly, it was the hardships of economic transition that promoted the advancement of recent historical studies. Due to the growing interest of the general public in issues related to inter-war and post-war history, many students thought that it would be easier to find a decent position on the shrinking job market if they specialized in recent history. Since the salaries of primary school, secondary school, and even high-school teachers are extremely low, a growing number of history students think that training in recent history can be made better use of by moving towards (more or less academic) journalism or NGO-related employment after graduation. Therefore, there is a constant demand for courses in recent history in universities, especially on Communism and post-Communism, and the number of students specializing in recent/contemporary history is by far greater than the number of students specializing in ancient or medieval history.

The first part of this section focuses on the development of Communist studies proper, that is, on monographs and collections of studies dedicated to the Communist period. Since, so far, these represent only a fragment of the body of writings that shaped the public memory of the recent past, the authors considered it important to include other

types of sources in this study, which have been crucial in shaping the way in which Communism is remembered in post-Communist Romania. Thus, memoirs, diaries, and oral history interviews, on the one hand, and collections of documents focusing on various topics, on the other hand, will be discussed as well.

As was mentioned, public demand created an opportunity for the development of recent historical studies in post-Communist Romania, but, in the early 1990s, there were few gifted professors who could teach and write on such topics. Consequently, a first step was to translate and publish works by specialists from abroad, starting with exiled authors. The Romanian-born political scientists Ghiță Ionescu (b. 1913) and Vladimir Tismăneanu (b. 1951) were the first to be published in their native country after 1989, and their penetrating analyses of Communism in Romania have been instrumental in the development of recent history studies. Ghiță Ionescu's book *Communism in Romania: 1944-1962*, originally published in 1964, is still the best introduction to the early history of Communist Romania.¹³¹ Vladimir Tismăneanu, from the University of Maryland, has written extensively on the political culture of Romanian Communism and provided path-breaking interpretations of this variant of "national-Stalinism," as he conceptualized the dogmatic type of Communism developed under both leaders: Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and Nicolae Ceaușescu.¹³² In his many writings on Romanian Communism, Tismăneanu has especially insisted on the inferiority complex of Romanian Communists and their low intellectual profile, which, combined with the weak tradition of Marxism in Romania, hindered real de-Stalinization and the appearance of a Marxist revisionist current in Romania.¹³³ Also, his studies shed new light on the power struggles within the Party that led to numerous assassinations and purges in the 1940s and 1950s.¹³⁴ Contrary to the commonplace view, according to which power was disputed by a "Muscovite" faction, subservient to the Soviets, and a local one, attached to national interests, Tismăneanu demonstrates that there were three factions competing with each other. None of them should be credited with genuinely defending the "national" line; only the control of power was at stake.

Another Western author whose books are first steps towards an evaluation of Romanian Communism is Dennis Deletant from University College London. In his two books, dedicated to the Ceaușescu

regime and to the Gheorghiu-Dej period, Deletant addresses a crucial issue, namely, the mechanisms of control, and rightly emphasizes the almost unparalleled use of terror in Romania as compared with East-Central Europe.¹³⁵ As the author shows, Gheorghiu-Dej made extensive use of physical terror, leaving a profoundly tamed population to his successor. For his part, Ceaușescu relied more on prevention and psychological terror; he opted for repression only as a last resort. Last but not least, the work of Katherine Verdery (City University of New York) on cultural policies and identity politics under Ceaușescu remains unrivaled to this day.¹³⁶ An anthropologist by training, Verdery shows that the nationalist line promoted by the Communist regime was reinforced by writers, historians, and philosophers who seized this opportunity to obtain better institutional positions. Another American anthropologist, who contributed not only to the examination of one of the extreme policies pursued by Ceaușescu, that of forced natality, but also to the establishment of feminist studies in Romania, is Gail Kligman, from University of California at Los Angeles.¹³⁷

From among local historians, Dinu C. Giurescu played a crucial role in the revival of recent history studies in post-1989 Romania. D. C. Giurescu was born in a family with a respectable tradition in historical studies – both his grandfather, Constantin Giurescu (1875–1918), and his father, Constantin C. Giurescu (1901–1977), were prominent historians and members of the Romanian Academy. Specializing in medieval history, Dinu Giurescu also authored a synthesis of Romanian history.¹³⁸ In 1988, he immigrated to the United States, where, related to his former preoccupation with historical monuments as a member of the Central State Commission for National Cultural Heritage between 1975 and 1985, he published *The Razing of Romania's Past*. This represents the first thorough analysis of Ceaușescu's systematization plan and the regime's irresponsible policy concerning the national architectural heritage.¹³⁹ Returning from exile in 1990, Dinu Giurescu decided to shift from medieval studies to recent history and, beginning in October 1990, he started to teach the mandatory course on contemporary Romanian history at the Faculty of History, University of Bucharest. Between 1994 and 1997 he edited *Arhiva* (Archive), a history supplement of the daily newspaper *Cotidianul*, in which many of his students at the University of Bucharest published articles on recent history topics. Prominent among Giurescu's numerous writings on the early Com-

munist period is his *Guvernarea Nicolae Rădescu*, which concentrates on the period between 6 December 1944 and 6 March 1945.¹⁴⁰ He convincingly demonstrates that it was the local Communists who, backed by Moscow, forced the last democratic government of Romania to resign, facilitating the extension of Soviet control over the country. Recently, his interest in the period of the Communist takeover produced a new book, dedicated to the period preceding the falsified elections of 1946, extending from 6 March 1945 to 7 January 1946.¹⁴¹

Florin Constantiniu (b. 1933) is another major historian preoccupied with the history of Romanian Communism. A thorough reader of archival sources, including Soviet sources, he has also concentrated on the establishment of the first Communist-dominated regime in Bucharest on 6 March 1945, which was considered to be the actual beginning of the Cold War.¹⁴² Assuming that Stalin must have held similar views on the different countries of East-Central Europe, Constantiniu examines documents related to the establishment of Communists in Poland in order to fill in the blank spaces in the Romanian history of the period. Moreover, his analysis of local developments takes into account the international context in which, in spite of the Yalta Agreements, the Russian leader was able to impose a Soviet-friendly government on Romania only a month after the conference. Continuing his research on the final period of WWII, Constantiniu has tackled another delicate problem: how did the Communist-dominated Romanian government succeed in regaining the whole of Transylvania after WWII?¹⁴³

As the works of Giurescu and Constantiniu illustrate, historians in Romania have been extremely cautious when writing about Communism: they have mostly studied the earlier periods of Communism, for which access to archival materials is easier. They have been reluctant to leave behind professional constraints and make assessments of controversial parts of the past without sufficient documentary evidence. Moreover, they have primarily been concerned with the reconstruction of events; thus, their monographs concentrate on very short time-spans in an extremely detailed manner.

Specialists from different fields, however, ventured to give overall interpretations of Romanian Communism or at least of a significant part of it, of one of its two regimes: the Gheorghiu-Dej or the Ceaușescu regime. One of the first works on the Dej period is by the political scien-

tist Stelian Tănase. His book "Elites and Society: The Gheorghiu-Dej Regime, 1948-1965" discusses a period that opened with one of the most violent and merciless Stalinization processes among the East-European Soviet satellites and ended with unexpected and surprising ideological relaxation.¹⁴⁴ Tănase concentrates, first and foremost, on the relationship between the Communist elite and society and addresses the way in which the Romanian Communist elite conceived and conducted the modernization of the country as a basis of its own legitimacy. The author perceptively argues that the Communist leadership put a strong emphasis on independence and industrialization, and thus united the goals of the political elite with those of the emerging professional elites.

One of the most important analyses of the monolithic Party faction around Gheorghiu-Dej has been provided by sociologist Pavel Câmpeanu, a member of the Communist movement from the underground years and later on one of the first intellectuals who openly criticized the Communist system.¹⁴⁵ His book "Ceaușescu: The Countdown Years" offers an insightful account of the period spent in prison before coming to power by the group of Communist militants that included, besides Gheorghiu-Dej, Ceaușescu and the author himself.¹⁴⁶ Câmpeanu's detailed account gives an impression of how important the period of the common socialization of the Party's future leadership was in determining the nature of the political culture of the Romanian Communist elite. This is especially significant because the crucial features of the regime's political culture remained unchanged until the demise of the system in December 1989.

Finally, very recently, the new generation of historians interested in the post-war period made their debut. Adrian Cioroianu (b. 1967) proposes a less "orthodox" approach to recent history than that of Romanian historians who think that no history can be written without entering the archives. Instead of going back in time to periods for which archives are, at least theoretically, open, he goes against the mainstream and addresses the last period of Communism by using other types of available sources. His book, written in French, focuses on a topic that is very spectacular to a foreign audience: the personality cult of Nicolae Ceaușescu, which was one of the most flamboyant in East-Central Europe.¹⁴⁷

From among Giurescu's students, Florin Șperlea and Cristian Vasile have published monographs on two important identity-forming institutions: the Army and the Church. Florin Șperlea (b. 1970) fo-

cuses on the Sovietization of the Romanian Army, and discusses the way in which the Royal Army was transformed into a "People's Army" during the period 1948-1955. Apart from the changes in the legislation that facilitated the process, Șperlea argues, the "People's Army" was created by purging the meritocratic elite and by promoting elements subservient to the new regime in its place.¹⁴⁸ Cristian Vasile (b. 1976) discusses the forced unification of the Greek Catholic Church, formally under the supervision of the Vatican, with the autocephalous Romanian Orthodox Church in 1948. His analysis highlights not only the repression that accompanied the union, but also the response of the members of the religious community, who stubbornly maintained their Church underground.¹⁴⁹ Both authors have employed a comparative approach, discussing the case of Romania in the context of the Soviet bloc. This trend is rather new: in Romanian historiography there was not much interest in developing comparative historical studies. However, the works discussed above prove that this type of approach has finally taken root in Romania.

Since access to documents related to the Communist Party has proven to be so difficult, oral history interviews and memoirs of former political prisoners, former dissidents, former party dignitaries, and officers of the secret police are crucial in shedding some light on the history of Romanian Communism. Furthermore, one should be aware that crucial decisions within the Communist Party were taken outside official meetings and, therefore, are never to be found in the archives. As was already mentioned, after the fall of the Communist regime numerous books containing the memoirs of those who suffered under the regime were published. To be sure, the quality of these books is uneven; also, the oral history interviews were in many cases taken after a considerable period of time (30-40 years), which poses questions concerning the accuracy of the testimonies. Nevertheless, oral history remains a crucial method in reconstructing the history of the inter-war and post-war years. From among the prominent personalities who suffered under, or because of, the Communist regime and gave book-length oral history interviews, one can mention, first and foremost, the former King Michael I of Romania¹⁵⁰ and the late post-1989 leader of the National Peasant Party, Corneliu Coposu (1914-1995).¹⁵¹ Many oral history projects, developed by universities, research institutes, NGOs, and committed individuals are well under way and, although numer-

ous volumes have already been published, their number is expected to increase tremendously in the near future.¹⁵²

The bulk of the testimonies of those who suffered under the Communist regime have been published in the form of memoirs or diaries. These writings are of two basic kinds. The first deals with the experiences of political prisoners during the period of Stalinist terror and roughly covers the period 1945-1964. Dissident writings and memoirs as well as diaries from the period, authored mainly by writers and generally covering the Ceaușescu period, belong to the second category. A well-represented subcategory of the latter are writings by former commentators of the Romanian desk of Radio Free Europe.

The greatest number of writings belong to the first type of diaries and memoirs. At the same time, their quality is uneven; again, it is sometimes quite difficult to confirm such testimonies or confront them with other kinds of sources. Nevertheless, some of the published diaries, preserved in spite of severe restrictions, are invaluable sources for recent history. An example is the diary of General Constantin Sănătescu, a major political and military figure during the 1940s.¹⁵³ The diary was hidden by the family throughout the entire Communist period in the hope that one day it would be published.¹⁵⁴ Ioan Hudiță (1896-1982), a former deputy general secretary of the National Peasant Party, also kept a diary for many years. The historian Dan Berindei, Hudiță's son-in-law and editor of the manuscript, has stated that the diary consists of approximately 30,000 pages.¹⁵⁵

As for memoirs from the early days of Communism, the best-represented genre is that of the eyewitness account from the prison or labor camp. Some of these are well-written, lengthy narratives, non-fictional novels, such as the five-volume memoirs of Ion Ioanid, former employee of Radio Free Europe after his release from the Romanian Gulag.¹⁵⁶ The most moving, however, is that of Constantin Cesianu, a former high-ranking diplomat in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Cesianu, who had been imprisoned twice, between 1948-1953 and 1959-1964, provides a detailed account of the conditions of detention and work in the forced labor camps around the first Danube-Black Sea Canal, revealing that it was only the belief in the arrival of the Americans that kept them alive.¹⁵⁷ Aurel Baghiu, a participant in the 1956 students' unrest in Timișoara, describes the atmosphere of those October days and the ruthless repression by the Romanian secret police in his

memoirs.¹⁵⁸ Memoirs of another kind are by persons who had been close to or members of the Communist Party before the Communist takeover and were purged shortly afterwards. The memoirs of Herbert (Belu) Zilber (1901-1978) are of paramount importance for the attempt to reconstruct the events that led to the arrest and subsequent assassination of Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu.¹⁵⁹ One should also mention the memoirs of Petre Pandrea, Pătrășcanu's brother-in-law, which contain, among other things, precious information on important figures of the Stalinist period in Romania.¹⁶⁰ The memoirs from later periods are of a very different kind. Since Ceaușescu inherited from his predecessor, Gheorghiu-Dej, a profoundly tamed population, he did not need to make use of random terror and to imprison large numbers of people. To be sure, there were people who suffered under Ceaușescu, but they suffered in a different way. The story to be told was no longer about prisons, labor camps, and biological survival. It was about dissidence and co-optation, alienation and cowardice, widespread malaise and compromise, frustration and fear. Quite naturally, the writings published after 1989, which relate to that period, have been mainly dissident writings and diaries, but quite a few non-dissident writers kept diaries in secret as well.

Of these, the most controversial is, undoubtedly, Paul Goma's three-volume diary. Goma (b. 1935), the most prominent Romanian anti-communist dissident, wrote a polemic, sometimes unfair, diary (in which he accuses many of his fellow intellectuals of compromise and cowardice) that aroused an enormous debate.¹⁶¹ Fellow writer and, at a certain moment, intimate friend of Goma, Florența Albu is one of the non-dissidents who nevertheless made daily notes under Communism, providing an insightful account of the condition of a woman writer under Communism.¹⁶² Another volume worth mentioning was authored by Stelian Tănase, who was one of the banned writers permanently supervised by the secret police. Thus, he opted for a very original recipe: to publish in parallel fragments of his diary with excerpts from his *Securitate* file.¹⁶³ Ioan Popa's book of memoirs represents a passionate account by an army officer who worked on the gigantic building site of the so-called House of the People, i.e., Ceaușescu's enormous palace which houses today the Romanian Parliament.¹⁶⁴ Writings of this sort are so numerous, that a thorough analysis of them would go far beyond the limits of the present study.¹⁶⁵

However, there is a category of memoirs that deserves a closer look, since their authors were responsible for the production of historical writings before 1989, and some continues to be. David Prodan (1902-1992), an outstanding Cluj-based historian of the modern period, authored one of the most important testimonies in this respect. His memoirs combines information on the development of Romanian historiography during the 20th century with critical remarks on issues such as the conscious distortion of history for political ends and the successful co-optation of historians by the regime.¹⁶⁶ Another prominent historian, Constantin C. Giurescu, who was imprisoned between May 1950 and July 1955, left behind in safe hands his prison memoirs in manuscript. The manuscript was edited by his son, historian Dinu C. Giurescu, and published after the breakdown of the Communist regime.¹⁶⁷ Alexandru Zub (b. 1934), the Iași-based historian and current director of the “A. D. Xenopol” History Institute, also discusses issues related to history writing during the communist and post-Communist periods in a book-length dialogue with Sorin Antohi.¹⁶⁸ Quite unique is Radu Constantinescu’s (b. 1940) approach. His book provides polemical, sometimes grotesque, Hieronymous Bosch-like literary portraits of one hundred Romanian historians whom the author considers to have been instrumental in providing intellectual support for the Communist regime.¹⁶⁹ Although the book might provide useful information on the personal and social settings of some less-known historians from the Communist period, one should be extremely cautious when making use of Constantinescu’s sarcastic portraits.

As stated above, an important segment that provided diaries and memoirs was that of the former speakers, analysts and collaborators of Radio Free Europe, who could engage without any restraint in writing such works after emigrating from Romania. They were able provide not only consistent autobiographical information, but also shed some light on issues such as the support given by RFE to dissidents and critical intellectuals in Romania or the constraints under which the broadcasting agency operated.¹⁷⁰ Writings by former critical intellectuals constitute another important source in investigating the recent past. In Romania there were only few dissidents who dared to publicly express their disagreement with the regime of Nicolae Ceaușescu. Moreover, there were even fewer those who were able to formulate an articulate critique of the Communist system. Of the very few critical analyses written in

the underground, the most important is that authored by Dan Petrescu and Liviu Cangeopol.¹⁷¹ The two authors wrote their book in 1988, and, although strictly watched by the secret police, succeeded in sending it to the United States, where it was published, but, unfortunately, just after the breakdown of the Communist regime. Nevertheless, their book remains the best critical analysis of the Communist system written in Romania before the fall of the regime, which, by the themes addressed—the ubiquity of guilt, the idea of moral regeneration, the alliance between critical intellectuals and workers—reminds one of the Central European dissidents. Another critical analysis of the communist system, written, unlike the previous one, from the perspective of a reformist, belongs to Mihai Botez (1927–1998). His main study, “The Second World”, elaborated in the early 1980s, transmitted by Radio Free Europe, and published only posthumously in Romania, is a critical structural analysis of Communism, which, although revealing the dysfunctional characteristics of the system, predicts its stability.¹⁷²

Not only those who suffered under Communism wrote or spoke about their experiences. After the collapse of Communism, several former high rank party officials acceded to requests for interviews or engaged in writing memoirs, and offered valuable testimonies for students of the Communist regime. As long as crucial decisions were taken outside official meetings and, therefore, are never to be found in the archives, it was from “them,” the members of the former *nomenklatura*, that one expects to find out what had happened behind the closed doors and what was in the mind of the people who ruled “us.” Most of the members of the Communist elite who decided to talk were persons once close to Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and, then, sooner or later, marginalized by Ceaușescu: Gheorghe Apostol, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, Alexandru Bârlădeanu, Gheorghe Gaston Marin, Corneliu Mănescu, Paul Niculesu-Mizil, Silviu Brucan, and Paul Sfetcu.¹⁷³

As a member of the Communist party from its underground years, a member of the Politburo from 1948 until 1969, and a friend of Dej from the time when both were workers in the small city of Galați, Gheorghe Apostol is, perhaps, the most important informant. Among the episodes he recalls, his account of the careful preparation of the discussions between Romanian communists and the Soviets concerning the presence of the Soviet troops in Romania is of chief importance, since he is the only survivor from those who were involved in this is-

sue.¹⁷⁴ As Minister of Foreign Affairs and head of the Romanian delegation to the United Nations General Assembly between 1961 and 1972, Mănescu is a key witness about Romania's international relations during the decade when its position of maverick ally within the Communist bloc manifested.¹⁷⁵ Ion Gheorghe Maurer, who, after 1961, when appointed President of the Council of Ministers, became the most influential person within the party except for Dej himself, was a key player in supporting Ceaușescu's candidacy to the party leadership. However, his testimony needs to be corroborated with that of Apostol, the counter-candidate, and those of other, more distant witnesses, such as Mizil or Birlădeanu, in order to grasp Ceaușescu's backstage maneuvers that assured him the support of a majority of the Politburo.¹⁷⁶ Paul Niculescu-Mizil, who is the only one who held central positions under both Dej and Ceaușescu, is the only one who insists on the continuity between the two leaders with regard to their attitudes towards the Soviet Union.¹⁷⁷ A former ambassador to Washington under Dej, then, marginalized by Ceaușescu, Silviu Brucan was one of the authors of the famous "letter of six" by former party veterans. His book, subtitled "Memoirs," is, in fact, an analysis of communism in Romania as envisaged by the author. Finally, Paul Sfetcu, the secretary of Gheorghiu-Dej, offers the most interesting insight into the private world of his patron, revealing some of the tensions between Dej and other members of the elite, and some of his private thoughts regarding political problems.¹⁷⁸

If memoirs, diaries, and oral history interviews are important in reconstructing the recent past, documents are crucial for such an endeavor. Some major collections of documents were also published during the above mentioned period. Of them, the most representative is a six-volume collection of documents of the former secret police, "The White Book of the Securitate" and "The White Book of the Securitate: Literary and Artistic Stories, 1969-1989",¹⁷⁹ edited by the Romanian Intelligence Service. Since publication of documents from the archives of the former *Securitate* has been a constant concern of public intellectuals and civil society in general, the publication of the above mentioned documents aroused a heated debate, especially because many felt that only carefully selected documents were allowed to be published. Therefore, one should be extremely careful when analyzing the volumes containing official documents from the files of the former

Securitate, since it is certain that the historians who edited them, even if in good faith, had to confine their search to the documents that are delivered to them.¹⁸⁰

Nevertheless, critical editions of documents, accompanied by serious introductory studies, are still rare birds in Romania. It is our opinion that the real problem is to be found in the incapacity of many historians to corroborate the sources and to make use of the different kinds of information available at this moment. Too often it is claimed that already published documents are irrelevant and only by getting full access to all archives can one write the “true” history of a particular period or event. Nevertheless, the poor quality of historiographic production in Romania with regard to the recent past reveals that, apart from some notable exceptions, a majority of the historians do not know how to make use of the existing sources. In fact, not a single history of the Communist period by a Romanian historian has been published until now. This does not mean that there are no problems in getting access to documents. However, the institutionalization of recent history as a discipline in post-Communist Romania depends not only on editing more documents but also on making sense of the enormous mass of sources published so far.

12. PUBLIC DEBATES: HISTORY AND EDUCATION

After decades of conformity, issues such as the Romanian monarchy and the legitimacy of the republican form of government, the interwar intellectuals’ support for the extreme right, Romanian anti-Semitism and the Holocaust, the ethnic minorities of this country, and Romania’s place in Europe revived the public sphere in Romania. Historians were asked to intervene in such debates in the name of “historical truth,” but journalists, politicians, NGO activists, former political prisoners and dissidents, critical intellectuals, and former party officials contributed to these polemics in much greater number than professionals in the field.

Of these debates, one of the most important, and still unfinished, is related to the nature of the events that led to the breakdown of the Ceaușescu regime: “true” revolution or coup d’état? Of all the former communist states of East-Central Europe, Romania is the most controversial case, not only because the revolution in that country contradicted the non-violent, peaceful, “post-modern” character of the other

1989 revolutions, but also due to the protracted and painful transition to democracy that country experienced. Foreign and Romanian scholars, disillusioned with the slow pace of the transition from Communism, have questioned the revolutionary nature of the events in 1989 and, to make this point, many began using the word revolution in quotation marks. Others went even further and stated openly that in December 1989 a coup d'état hindered the popular uprising in becoming a revolution.¹⁸¹ Hence, the Romanian revolution was defined as "doubtful," "entangled," "unfinished," "gunned down," "stolen," or "diverted." In fact, more than a decade after the 1989 events, writings on the topic have been authored mainly by political scientists and journalists, while historians proved to be quite reluctant to address such a recent past. Some documents related to the 1989 events have been published.¹⁸² It remains, however, up to the new emerging generation of historians to carry out research on the collapse of Romanian communism. Substantial works are still to be expected.

A more recent and heated controversy, however, concerning the public and pedagogical role of historical studies in Romania, needs to be discussed in detail due to its long-term implications. The polemic initiated by the introduction, during the 1999/2000 academic year, of the first series of alternative history textbooks in post-Communist Romania deserves a thorough analysis. First and foremost, the debate uncovered some of the intricate, structural problems of historical research, writing, and teaching in present day Romania. Equally important, this polemic revealed the magnitude of the burdensome task the next generations of historians have to undertake in order to achieve the long awaited synchronism with Western scholarship.

A parliamentary speech by Sergiu Nicolaescu, delivered on 5 October 1999, inaugurated the debate on the alternative history textbooks. In his speech, Nicolaescu—an independent member of the Senate (the upper chamber of the Parliament)—condemned the alleged "anti-national" character of the history textbook for the 12th grade coordinated by the Cluj-based historian Sorin Mitu. The textbook, dealing with Romanian history, was one of the five alternative textbooks released that academic year.¹⁸³ However, before analyzing Nicolaescu's speech and its aftershocks, some brief information on his social and intellectual setting would facilitate the understanding of the context. Sergiu Nicolaescu is a successful film director, specializing in historical action

movies, who made a career under the regime of Ceaușescu. The vast majority of his movies attempted to present the country's medieval past among the lines of the Romanian Communist party program and were quite popular in the 1970s and 1980s, under the conditions of cultural autarchy. His most well-known film is *Mihai Viteazul* (Michael the Brave), dedicated to the medieval ruler who, in 1600, united for several months the principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania under a single rule. As Boia's works illustrates, in the light of the myths of continuity and unity of the Romanians on the present day territory of the country, the movie was the perfect embodiment of Ceaușescu's vision of a "national" history.

Turning back to the alternative textbooks polemic, it should be noted, however, that Nicolaescu, in his intervention before the Romanian Senate, stated that the Sigma textbook "should be burned in a public square," because it presents the history of a people without identity. The next day, the populist daily newspaper *Adevărul* (established after 1989 on the pattern of the former party newspaper *Scinteia*) published an article by journalist Cristian Tudor Popescu entitled "How many histories does Romania have?" In his article, which became one of the hallmarks of the polemic, Popescu characterized the Sigma textbook as "anti-national" and "subversive," and criticized the authors' approach to the great figures of "national" history. Quite rapidly, the "reactionary" nucleus of former national Communist historians of the Ceaușescu period regrouped and launched an attack against this textbook. More generally, the attack was directed against those who were advocating the rewriting of "national" history, the textbook coordinated by Mitu being used only as a pretext. At the same time, many took this opportunity to attack the center-right government and its educational reforms, carried out by the Minister of Education of the time, Andrei Marga, the former rector of the University of Cluj.

The arguments of those who contested the Sigma textbook have been mainly related to an alleged undignified treatment by the authors of great figures of the past, such as the Dacian king Decebal or of sacred themes like the formation of the Romanian people. Furthermore, some of its critics accused the coordinator of the Sigma textbook of serving the interests of Hungary and its alleged claims over Transylvania, by questioning the continuity of the Romanians on the present-day territory of the country. Such arguments also received support from a

large part of the public. In response to criticism, both officials of the Ministry of Education and academics, including Sorin Mitu, the coordinator of the indicted textbook, proved to be slow and vacillating in providing serious arguments in favor of the alternative history textbooks or in defense of their work. A more articulate response, however, came from young liberal intellectuals, especially in a series of polemic articles published by the weekly *Revista 22*, the publication of the Group for Social Dialogue. In this respect, Cristian Preda authored a perceptive article in which he argued that the debate proved the incapacity of the Romanian intellectuals to initiate and carry on debates over the most relevant aspects of the public life.¹⁸⁴ Otherwise, there were very few specialized and critical analyses of the officially approved history textbooks.

Actually, if one engages in a comparative analysis of the five textbooks released in 1999, one can conclude that none of the five textbooks can be a model for the “new” history that has to be taught in post-Communist Romania.¹⁸⁵ However, in spite of its weak points, there is no reason to consider the Sigma textbook “anti-national,” as many politicians, journalists, and some academics stated. To its credit, this textbook contains some brief but clear and direct statements that lead to a better understanding of controversial issues than entire pages of other texts. In fact, of all five textbooks, the Sigma textbook provides the most updated and modern approach, challenging many of the clichés of the national Communist historiography. At the same time, its major weaknesses are to be found not so much in its content, but rather in the way it is organized, which creates the impression of a work done hastily without paying enough attention to details and leaving too much to be inferred. Among the other textbooks, the one published by Petrion reproduces, with some alterations, the national Communist idea of Romanian history, as it emerged in the late 1960s and the early 1970s.¹⁸⁶ The others, published by All, Rao, and Humanitas, are closer to the Sigma textbook in their attempt to project a new image upon the “national” history, but all give unfortunately a strange impression of unevenness.¹⁸⁷ In fact, many of the theoretical weaknesses that characterize all the five textbooks are rooted in the incomplete or obsolete coverage of their topics in the academic field. For instance, topics such as the ethnic origins of the nation, the origins of backwardness and underdevelopment, the roots of Romanian anti-

Semitism, and the characteristics of Romanian fascism or Communism have not been addressed properly by established academics or by official, i.e., state-sponsored history research institutes. The textbooks are nothing more than an image of the discipline, with its achievements and failures over the past decade.

13. CONCLUSIONS

When addressing the changes in Romanian historiography after 1989, the first thing that comes to mind is the timid trend towards diversification within the discipline. The first step in this direction, however, was made towards the end of the Communist period, in spite of the cultural autarchy *Annales* school. Such a trend has been continued after 1989 and gained momentum because it attracted the most gifted students. In fact, in the early 1990s, the rejection of event-based, political history became the latest fashion among students, indeed the equivalent of “real” professionalism. Moreover, this trend was perceived as being synonymous with de-ideologizing history writing not only because it went against the political and event-based type of history promoted under the former regime, but also because it was supported exactly by those, very few indeed, who were credited as genuine professionals. Nevertheless, the adoption of the *Annales* school – which was just one of the new trends in postwar western historical writing – was a necessary step in the right direction, but hardly a sufficient one.

In fact, the regeneration of history as a discipline after decades of ideological constraints proved to be a long and tortuous process, replicating, more often than not, the pattern of Romania’s democratic transition. Such a process depends not only on the popularity it gains among practitioners, but also on their status. In this respect, Romanian post-Communist historiography is still dominated by a clash between the pre-1989 establishment of the discipline, which continues to be influential in spite of temporary setbacks, and the group of historians who enjoy a great professional prestige because of their resistance to the ideological intrusions of the former regime. The controversies over the new synthesis of Romanian history, published under the aegis of the Romanian Academy, and the alternative history textbooks have been a reflection of this continuing dispute. To the extent that the former group is not going to reproduce itself, the clash will end with the

passing of the generation that came to age in the period of national Communism.

The removal of those involved in the (re)production of the national Communist master narrative represents, however, only a de-ideologizing turn. The readjustment of the discipline to Western standards requires also a revolt against the pre-Communist “national” tradition, not just an indiscriminating return to it. Such a step has been of paramount importance in a country where, due to the imperatives of nation-building, the legacy of romanticism in historical writing was preserved up to the Communist takeover, to be only reinforced after the nationalist turn of the Communist regime. The de-mythologizing turn initiated by Lucian Boia represented such an eagerly awaited moment. The popularity of the author among the representatives of the young generation raises great hopes. Such a direction does not add much in methodological terms: Boia’s own preferences tend towards the *Annales* school, which was already trendy in Romania. The de-mythologizing turn is rather a state of mind: its proponents could practically choose to challenge the interpretation of any topic from the national canon. However, they have to do it observing the professional standards.

In this respect, the de-mythologizing turn should be accompanied by a re-professionalizing turn. In other words, such critical perspectives should not be essayistic, but theoretically and methodologically sound. Historians in Romania must catch up with developments in the discipline since the Communist regime interrupted the normal intellectual exchange with the outside world. Wholesale import of Western methodologies, however, is certainly not an easy task because history is not only deeply divided among numerous schools, but also at the point of struggling for survival as a profession. At the same time, things are changing very slowly in the desired direction since in Romania there is little interest in theoretical or methodological issues. Historical theory is not exactly the most visited discipline in the field of Romanian historical studies. Thus, there are historians who still genuinely believe in the scientific objectivity of their scholarship. As the 1999 polemic over alternative history textbooks has shown, the belief in a unique, “true” national history is still widespread. The idea that historians could support, in good faith and observing professional standards, varied and opposing views is still far from being internalized by a majority of historians.

As for methodological diversification, this depends primarily on individual efforts. In Romania, a powerful school was—and still is—that of positivistic, event-based, political history. In fact, in all faculties, history continues to be primarily a narration of events, concerned with politics, presenting a view from above, and based on documents. Historians specialize primarily in a certain period of the past, and not in a certain variety of history: social, economic, cultural, intellectual, etc. In short, methodological and theoretical issues concerning history writing and the establishment of history as a social science in accordance with the Western pattern are not high on the Romanian historians' agenda. The institutionalization of "new trends" is still at the very beginning and in this respect one can rather speak of gifted individuals than of institutions or schools.

Therefore, after 1989 the most spectacular change in historical studies was not methodological but thematic, driven by the reorientation of students' interest towards recent history, that is, post-WWI history. The fields of medieval studies and modern history (up to WWI), so popular with bright students before 1989, suffered a sharp decline. Such a trend is not yet visible in terms of historiographical works, since not enough time has elapsed to allow the debut of the generation which started its education in post-Communism. At the same time, while the interest of history students and the general public shifted towards recent history, the field itself has to be re-invented after 1989 because of the ideological constraints and de-professionalization it experienced under Communism. It may be argued, therefore, that from the conceptual and methodological viewpoints there is still much to do as far as recent history is concerned. Although some progress has been made in terms of event-based history and publication of sources, we still wait for further interdisciplinary approaches and theoretically innovative perspectives to emerge.

Last, but not least, financial problems could seriously stand in the way of reforming historical writing. The trend towards a "new" history could develop further inasmuch as some promising young historians were willing to engage in reforming the field. A general problem, however, is that most of the gifted members of the new generation are desperately competing for grants abroad, as long as finding a decently paid job at home remains a major concern. For instance, a simple search on the Internet reveals that a majority of the relevant studies or articles

published in foreign languages are authored by young historians who have studied abroad. At the same time, of those who decided to stay and work in Romania, many are not able to compete for international recognition and often do not have the skills and training to reform the discipline in their own country. In other words, young historians who enter the domestic history job market are not always as talented, diligent and willing to change the existing situation as one might have thought.

Considering the above, it may be argued that, during the period 1990-2004, the field of historical studies in Romania changed only slowly and began to replicate timidly the Western trend towards fragmentation. However, as shown in this study, no spectacular changes occurred. When applied to the Romanian context, the categories of “old” and “new” history lose much of their Western meaning. In Romania, “old” history means, in general, event-based, dogmatic, dry, primitive-positivistic, unimaginative and, eventually, uninteresting history. “New” history, however, is much more difficult to define. It is, in fact, a complex mixture of “new” and not so new, sometimes quite “old,” trends in Western historical writing. The de-mythologizing turn could be seen as blending a strain of radical historical relativism with some drops of deconstructionism. Paradoxically, it is exactly this kind of mixture of old and new that permitted the reform of history writing to be initiated and carried out timidly in an overwhelmingly hostile environment. With unimaginable difficulties, the trend towards “new” history has, nevertheless, gained momentum.

NOTES

- 1 Categories of “old” and “new” are discussed in this study in Peter Burke’s sense of traditional paradigm and new history. See Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives in Historical Writing*, 2-6.
- 2 Murgescu, “The Romanian Historiography in the 1990s”.
- 3 Iordachi and Trencsényi, “In Search of a Usable Past: The Question of National Identity in Romanian Studies, 1990-2000”.
- 4 Vultur, “New Topics, New Tendencies and New Generations of Historians in Romanian Historiography”.
- 5 Vlad Georgescu (1937-1988), one of the most gifted historians of the post-war generation, has addressed this issue in the brilliant essay *Politică și istorie: Căzul comuniștilor români, 1944-1977*. Georgescu, after unsuccessful attempts to organize a dissident movement and an alternative “flying” uni-

versity, emigrated in 1979. As a director of the Romanian desk of Radio Free Europe (RFE) between 1982 and 1988, he continued to support the cause of those who, against all odds, dared to publicly criticize the Communist regime of Nicolae Ceaușescu. Georgescu was the last in a row of three RFE Romanian desk directors—the other two were Noel Bernard and Mihai Cismărescu—who died in suspicious conditions. His essay, written during the 1970s and smuggled out of the country, was published posthumously in Romania only after the breakdown of the Communist regime.

- 6 For instance, regarding the problem of the origins of the Romanians, the official version changed appreciably from one stage to another. During the first stage, 1948-1958, to stress the relatedness of the Romanians to the Russians, the Romanian nation was considered the result of a process that involved Dacians, Romans, and Slavs. During the second stage, 1958-1974, the role of the Slavs was dramatically diminished, while the role of Dacians and Romans became paramount. Finally, during the third stage, 1974-1989, a strong emphasis was put on the autochthonous Dacians.
- 7 One of the founding fathers of Romanian historiography, Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940) interpreted the history of the Romanians as a sort of devolution, from a mythical time when the Romanians lived happily in social harmony, through more and more turbulent periods, when neighboring peoples—Hungarians, Turks, Russians, and Jews—interfered. This was the dominant historical view up to the Communist takeover, perpetuated even by some of Iorga's critics, most prominently by Constantin C. Giurescu. Giurescu criticized Iorga concerning small details, but he did not challenge Iorga's main interpretation of Romanian history.
- 8 Among the purged historians were Constantin C. Giurescu (1901-1977), Gheorghe Brătianu (1898-1953) and P.P. Panaitescu (1900-1967). Each case is emblematic in its own way. Gheorghe Brătianu, perhaps the most gifted of them, came from a family of outstanding liberal politicians that, since 1848, had played a crucial role in the Westernization of Romania. Brătianu was imprisoned and died in the Sighet prison after the Communist takeover. Giurescu was also imprisoned by the Communists, but was released from the Aiud prison after five years. After a period of marginalization, he played a prominent role again from the late 1960s until his death in 1977. The most interesting case is perhaps that of P. P. Panaitescu, a specialist in the history of the Slavs and one of the few major historians who sympathized with the legionary movement during the inter-war years. Panaitescu was quickly recuperated by the Communist regime after a short period of detention and was instrumental in emphasizing the role of the Slavs in the history of the Romanians. It is also worth mentioning that Panaitescu devised a plan of admitting some of the former legionaries into the ranks of the Communist party.
- 9 Among the Marxist historians, one should distinguish between professional historians such as Andrei Oțetea, David Prodan, or even Petre Constantinescu-Iași, who applied Marxist theory in order to produce a sort of "histo-

ry of society,” concerned with social and economic problems, and apparatchiks (such as Ion Popescu-Puțuri), whose unsophisticated mindsets only allowed them to write propagandistic works on Party history according to the official line of the time. A thorough analysis of Marxist approaches to history under Communism poses difficult theoretical and methodological problems. A general characterization can be made by looking at the way in which different historians made use of categories such as class struggle or the emphasis on economic determinism and social conflict.

- 10 After the Communist takeover, Mihail Roller (1908-1958) held top positions in both the Party and the academic hierarchy of the country. He was vice-president of the Romanian Academy (1949-1954), head of the Romanian History Department of the Romanian Military Academy (1948-1955), and deputy director of the Institute for Historical and Social-Political Studies of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (1955-1958).
- 11 New institutions were established during the period between 1946 and 1948 in order to support the Russification campaign: the *Cartea Rusă* (Russian Book) publishing house and bookstore, the Institute of Romanian-Soviet Studies, the Romanian-Russian Museum and the Maxim Gorky Russian Language Institute. For more on Romanian cultural Stalinism see Georgescu, *The Romanians: A History*, 239-42.
- 12 For more on the reinterpretation of various historical events, see Georgescu, *Politică și istorie*, 9-50.
- 13 Actually, the decline of Roller preceded his death, which occurred in suspicious circumstances in 1958. Some spoke of suicide, others of political assassination carried out on Gheorghiu-Dej's orders. Although no reliable information has been disclosed until now, some rumors indicate that Roller, while pursuing his research on the social movements in pre-Communist Romania, started to investigate the 1933 workers' strike at the Grivița Railway Repair Shops in Bucharest. Gheorghiu-Dej, the leader of the Romanian Communist Party, had also participated in that strike and, according to the official history of the Party, played an important role. It seems that interviewing some Party veterans marginalized by Dej, who took the opportunity to reveal that the role of Dej was far less important than that of the others, Roller came into conflict with Dej.
- 14 The publication of Marx's manuscript was decided at the Politburo meeting of 20 January 1964. For the transcript of that meeting, see Betea, *Convorbiri neterminate: Corneliu Mănescu în dialog cu Lavinia Betea* 275-298. For more on the sinuous path of Marx's notes on the Romanians, from their discovery to their publication, see Paul Niculescu-Mizil, *O istorie trăită* 134-7 and 251-93.
- 15 This campaign led to the closing of all the institutions established in the late 1940s, in order to support the rapid Sovietization of Romania's cultural life. For the perspective of an apparatchik with regard to the shifts

in history-writing during the Gheorghiu-Dej period, see Țugui, *Istoria și limba română în vremea lui Gheorghiu-Dej*. Of the rehabilitation of major historians from the pre-WWII period, the best example is that of Nicolae Iorga. Completely ignored after 1948, Iorga was recuperated by the Communist regime in 1965, and many of his books were gradually republished. In 1971, even the research institute established by Iorga was renamed after its founder.

- 16 This is the case of Constantin C. Giurescu, the author of a synthesis of Romanian history until 1821, the main work of this kind in his generation after that of Iorga. After a period of detention and one of marginalization, he was institutionally reintegrated and allowed to publish again. He co-authored (with his son Dinu C. Giurescu) one of the four syntheses of history produced under the Communist regime.
- 17 After 1968, Nicolae Ceaușescu manifested a special interest in the medieval past of the country. As a consequence, during the 1970s and 1980s, historians paid special attention to medieval rulers and their anti-Ottoman struggle.
- 18 Under Communism, four main syntheses of Romanian history were published: (1) Daicoviciu et al., eds., *Istoria României*, 4 vols. This was the largest, started in 1950 under the supervision of Mihail Roller, but finished and published after his death. (2) Constantinescu et al., *Istoria României: Compendiu*; (3) Oțetea, ed., *Istoria poporului român*; and (4) Giurescu and Giurescu, *Istoria Românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri și pînă astăzi*.
- 19 For the idea of “national” history put forward by the Romanian Communist Party’s program, see *Programul Partidului Comunist Român de făurire a societății socialiste multilateral dezvoltate și înaintare a României spre comunism*, 27–64.
- 20 For Gheorghiu-Dej’s speeches, see *Scînteia* (11 May 1951), and Gheorghiu-Dej, *40 de ani de luptă sub steagul biruitor al marxism-leninismului*. See also Nicolae Ceaușescu, “P.C.R. continuator al luptei revoluționare și democratice al poporului român, al tradițiilor muncitorești și socialiste”.
- 21 The declaration of the “free” historians (a name given in the revolutionary fashion of renaming everything by adding the adjective “free”), some of whom were indeed most respected professionals in the field, was signed by David Prodan, Sigismund Jakó, Henri H. Stahl, Dionisie M. Pipidi, Șerban Papacostea, Pompiliu Teodor, Viorica Moisiuc, Andrei Pipidi, Ștefan Andreescu, Octavian Iliescu, Petre Alexandrescu, Gheorghe Brătescu, Alexandru Zub, and Ștefan Gorovei. See *Revista de istorie* No. 42 (1989): 1167–1168.
- 22 The first to be mentioned among these initiatives is the Civic Academy, which succeeded in establishing an archive of oral history interviews with participants in the early anti-Communist movement known as “the armed resistance in the mountains,” an annual conference, and a museum of Communism in the building of the former prison of Sighet. Many of the

prominent inter-war politicians, such as Iuliu Maniu, Dinu Brătianu, Gheorghe Brătianu, died in the Sighet prison. The review *Memoria* (Memory) and the Timișoara-based publishing house Marineasa also regularly publish materials (eyewitness accounts, oral history interviews, testimonies and documents) on the Communist repression.

- 23 In May 1990, József Antall, the head of the first freely elected government of post-Communist Hungary, made his famous statement: "In my soul, I feel like I am the prime minister of fifteen million Hungarians." The remark suggested that the Antall government was responsible not only for Hungary's population of 10.5 million, but also for the 3 million ethnic Hungarians living in the neighboring countries and the alleged 1.5 million Hungarians around the world. This statement especially angered the governments in Bucharest and Bratislava, and seriously damaged their relations with Budapest. See Kende, "The Trianon Syndrome: Hungarians and Their Neighbors". However, Romanian politicians, journalists and academics could not find a proper answer in the majority of cases. More often than not, their discourses were based on the ethnonational argument rather than on democratic principles. As a response to the problem of minority rights raised by the Romanian Hungarians and the Hungarian government supporting the "ethnic autonomy" of the Hungarians living in the neighboring countries, the Romanians gave a disproportionate attention to issues of national identity and loyalty towards a "unitary nation-state."
- 24 The Greater Romania Party (GRP) is the largest nationalistic party in present-day Romania. During the 1990s it promoted an anti-Hungarian and anti-Semitic discourse in order to attract votes, but this strategy had limited success in the 1992 and 1996 elections. In the 2000 elections, after modifying its message into an anti-establishment and anti-corruption one, the GRP emerged as a powerful political force and its leader, the charismatic Corneliu Vadim Tudor, entered the second round of the presidential elections. In the 2004 elections, however, it performed much poorer.
- 25 This is the current Social Democratic Party. It emerged as the main political force during the 1989 revolution under the name National Salvation Front, and mostly included second- and third-rank Communist Party activists. After mergers with smaller political forces and changes of names (National Democratic Salvation Front, Party of Social Democracy in Romania), it won in three of the four post-1989 free elections. Its charismatic leader, Ion Iliescu, was elected president for two mandates (1992-1996) and (2000-2004), as well as provisory president until a new Constitution was voted (1990-1992). It still is the main political party in present-day Romania, currently in opposition after the 2004 elections.
- 26 Among the most important political forces of the "democratic opposition" of 1990-1996 were the Christian Democrat National Peasant Party,

the National Liberal Party, the Hungarian Democratic Union in Romania, and the Party of the Civic Alliance. The first three became part of the governing coalition after the 1996 elections. The first two are the major traditional (inter-war) democratic parties that re-emerged after the fall of Communism, while the fourth is newly established, on the model of the political forces formed by former dissidents in Central Europe. From these three, only the National Liberal Party is still in Parliament. Since the 2004 elections, it has been in power again, as the senior partner in the present governing coalition. The Hungarian Democratic Union in Romania is the major ethnic party in this country and still the sole political party of the Hungarian population in Romania, which is the largest outside the borders of Hungary.

- 27 Georgescu, *Istoria românilor: De la origini până în zilele noastre*.
- 28 Georgescu, *Politică și istorie: Cazul comuniștilor români, 1944-1977*. Some other works, such as Victor Frunză's *Istoria stalinismului în România*, first published in Denmark in 1984, have been published in Romania as well, after 1989. Victor Frunză has also edited a collection of articles, studies, and essays authored by Vasile C. Dumitrescu (an important figure of the Romanian exile in Germany) under the title *O istorie a exilului românesc, 1944-1989*. It is also worth mentioning Pamfil Șeicaru's work *Istoria partidelor Național, Țărănist și Național-Țărănist*, first published in 1963 in Spain.
- 29 Constantiniu, *O istorie sinceră a poporului român*.
- 30 Drăgan, *Istoria românilor*.
- 31 Djuvara, *O scurtă istorie a românilor povestită celor tineri*. On Djuvara's impressions upon returning home after 1989 and his period of teaching at the Faculty of History, University of Bucharest, see his memoirs, *Amintiri din pribegie, 1948-1990*, especially 437-462.
- 32 See Guizot, *L'histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1789: Racontée a mes petits-enfants*.
- 33 Bărbulescu, Deletant, Hitchins, Papacostea and Teodor, *Istoria României*.
- 34 In 1978, Ștefan Ștefănescu, the editor of the first comprehensive dictionary of Romanian historical studies, the "Encyclopedia of Romanian historiography", announced in his foreword to the book that the writing of a new synthesis was a major project for the following period. See Ștefănescu, ed., *Enciclopedia istoriografiei românești*, 20.
- 35 *Istoria Românilor* vols. I-IV.
- 36 The prominent medievalist and former collaborator in the pre-1989 project Șerban Papacostea published a critical article in which he revealed that his work had been included in the 2001 multi-volume collective publication without his consent. Furthermore, in his penetrating criticism, Papacostea openly stated that the entire enterprise had been based on improvisation and "vast plagiarism." See Papacostea, "O carte de istorie și istoria ei". Another important historian specializing in medieval studies, Ștefan Andreescu, who had also participated in the first project, in the introduction to one

- of his books indicates which chapters were plagiarized by the authors of the synthesis. See Andreescu, *Perspective medievale*, 6-7.
- 37 Boia, *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*, translated into English as *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness*.
 - 38 Besides the above-mentioned work, Boia wrote a second book along the same lines, *Jocul cu trecutul: Istoria între adevăr și ficțiune*. Otherwise, most of his works were published in France, some even before the fall of Communism, and only some were translated later into Romanian. His impressive French publication list includes: *L'Exploration imaginaire de l'espace; La fin du monde: Une histoire sans fin; La Mythologie scientifique du communisme; Entre L'Ange et la Bête: Le Mythe de l'Homme différent de l'Antiquité a nos jours; Pour une histoire de l'imaginaire; Pour vivre deux cents ans: Essai sur le mythe de la longévité; Le Mythe de la Démocratie*. Boia also produced a brief synthesis of Romanian history that focuses on issues of national characterology, intended for a foreign audience. The book was first published in English as *Romania: Borderland of Europe*, subsequently translated into Romanian as *România, țară de frontieră a Europei*.
 - 39 See Boia, ed., *Mituri istorice românești*, and idem, *Miturile comunismului românesc* 2 vols. A one-volume edition, gathering the most representative studies from the two volumes on the myths of Romanian Communism, was subsequently published in 1998.
 - 40 See Bălcescu, *Românii supt Mihai-Voievod Viteazul*.
 - 41 See Boia, *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*, 26.
 - 42 Pop, *Istoria, adevărul și miturile*.
 - 43 For an introduction into the ideas of Robert Rösler and Pál Hunfalvy see Kellogg, *A History of Romanian Historical Writing*.
 - 44 See Xenopol, *Teoria lui Rösler: Studii asupra stăruinței românilor în Dacia Traiană*.
 - 45 See the long review to Xenopol's above-mentioned work in Onciul, *Scrieri istorice* (Historical writings), vol. 1. 131-260.
 - 46 Mihail Roller argued that the wealthy and those connected either to the administrative apparatus or to the Army retreated to the south of the Danube, "liberating" the "exploited classes." Thus, a stable population, consisting of free Romanized peasants, existed on the territory of present-day Romania. It is true, Roller continues, that the population was influenced by migratory populations, among which the Slavs played a crucial role. Nevertheless, Roller argues, at the time when the Hungarians arrived in Transylvania, Romanian political entities were already in place. See Roller, *Probleme de istorie: Contribuții la lupta pentru o istorie științifică în R.P.R.*
 - 47 In fact, there are historians from Cluj, notably Sorin Mitu and Ovidiu Pecican, who have argued in newspaper articles that this hypothesis must not be taken for granted anymore and has to be seriously reconsidered.
 - 48 Adolf Armbruster, *Romanitatea românilor: Istoria unei idei*. The first edition was published in 1972.

- 49 Bârză and Brezeanu, *Originea și continuitatea românilor: Arheologie și tradiție istorică*. Brezeanu also published a second book, which generally reiterates the ideas of the previous work. See his *Romanitatea orientală în evul mediu: De la cetățenii romani la națiunea medievală*.
- 50 Papacostea, *Românii în secolul al XIII-lea: Între cruciată și imperiul mongol*. See also his *Geneza statului în Evul Mediu românesc: Studii critice*.
- 51 Andreescu, *Vlad Țepeș: Dracula*. The first edition was published in 1976, on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of Vlad Țepeș' death.
- 52 Cristea, *Acest domn de la miazănoapte: Ștefan cel Mare în documnete inedite venețiene*.
- 53 Gorovei, *Întemeierea Moldovei: Probleme controversate*.
- 54 Of Ovidiu Pecican's works, one can mention: *Troia, Veneția, Roma; Arpadieni, angevini, români, Originile istorice ale regionalismului românesc*. Pecican is a member of the debate group around *Provincia* (The Province), a journal published both in Romanian and in Hungarian, which focuses on social and political problems related to Transylvania in general and, in particular, to the issue of reorganizing the Romanian state in a decentralized form.
- 55 See, for instance, Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei*.
- 56 Popa, *Țara Maramureșului în veacul al XIV-lea* and *La începuturile evului mediu românesc: Țara Hațegului*.
- 57 Lukács, *Țara Făgărașului în Evul Mediu: Secolele XIII-XIV*.
- 58 Drăgan, *Nobilimea românească din Transilvania: 1440-1514*.
- 59 Feneșan, *Constituirea principatului autonom al Transilvaniei*.
- 60 See Panaitescu, "De ce n-au cucerit turcii Țările române?," 111-18 (the page numbers refer to the reprint edition).
- 61 Maxim, *Țările Române și Înalta Poartă: Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în Evul Mediu*.
- 62 Panait, *Pace, război și comerț în Islam: Țările Române și dreptul otoman al popoarelor, secolele XV-XVII*. The work is translated into English as *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace*.
- 63 Pop, *Instituții medievale românești: Adunările cneziale și nobiliare (boierești) din Transilvania în secolele XIV-XVI*.
- 64 Pop has extensively studied in large Western libraries: in the United States, as a Fulbright visiting professor at the University of Pittsburgh and as the director of the Romanian Cultural Center in New York; in France, Great Britain, Italy, and Hungary.
- 65 Among the books published by Pop in English are *The Ethno-Confessional Structure of Medieval Hungary and Transylvania* and *Romanians and Hungarians from the 9th to the 14th century: The Genesis of the Transylvanian Medieval State*. His later works, based on the idea of a medieval Romanian nation are *Istoria Transilvaniei medievale: De la etnogeneza românilor pînă la Mihai Viteazul*, *Geneza medievală a națiunilor moderne: Secolele XIII-XVI*, and *Națiunea română medievală: Solidarități etnice românești în secolele XIII-XVI*.

- 66 Murgescu, *Istorie românească-istorie universală, 600-1800*.
- 67 See *Istorie românească-istorie universală*, 213.
- 68 Apostol Stan is a historian of the modern period, previously specialized in the agrarian problem prior to the 1848 revolution. His post-1989 books include *Putere politică și democrație în România, 1859-1918*; *Revoluția de la 1848: Boieri și țărani*; *Ion Mihalache: Destinul unei vieți*; *Protectoratul Rusiei asupra Principatelor Române, 1774-1856: Între dominație absolută și anexiune*. Anastasie Iordache had previously studied Romanian social and political history between the end of the 19th century and WWI. His publications are *Criza politică din România și războaiele balcanice, 1911-1913*; *Parlamentul României în anii reformelor și ai primului război mondial, 1907-1918*.
- 69 Books by the most reputed historians of the *Annales* school, e.g. Fernand Braudel, Georges Duby, Jacques Le Goff, and Pierre Chaunu, were published during the 1980s in the distinguished series "Arts and Civilizations". The publisher was the Meridiane publishing house, which specialized in art history.
- 70 However, this trend was quite marginal under Communism. This is also illustrated by the fact that Alexandru Duțu was not included in the only encyclopedia of Romanian historiography published under the Communist regime, in 1978, even though he had already published numerous articles and several books by that time.
- 71 Duțu, *Cărțile de înțelepciune în cultura română*; *Eseu în istoria modelelor umane: Imaginea omului în literatură și pictură*; idem, *Alexândria ilustrată de Năstase Negrule*; idem, *Dimensiunea umană a istoriei*.
- 72 Duțu, *Idea de Europa și evoluția conștiinței europene*. Duțu also played an important role in establishing new professional links with France after the collapse of Communism; see the volume Duțu coedited with Norbert Dodille, *Culture et politique*.
- 73 Daniel Barbu, *Scrisoare pe nisip: Timpul și privirea în civilizația românească a secolului al XVIII-lea*. His previous intellectual preoccupations were circumscribed to similar themes; see *Manuscrise bizantine în colecțiile din România* and *Pictura murală din Țara Românească în secolul al XIV-lea*.
- 74 Barbu's continuous interest in reconstructing patterns of thought allowed him to gradually shift the focus of his intellectual endeavors from history to political science. He has to be credited with the establishment of the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Bucharest, where he has strongly encouraged the development of this academic field on a broad interdisciplinary basis.
- 75 See Barbu, *Bizanț contra Bizanț: Explorări în cultura politică românească*. Other interdisciplinary works by the same author, combining historical and political science methods: *Byzance, Rome et les Roumains: Essais sur la production politique de la foi au Moyen Âge*; *Republica absentă: Politică și societate în România postcomunistă*; and *O arheologie constituțională românească: Studii și documente*.

- 76 From among his works, two can be mentioned in this context: *Modernitatea politică și românismul*, and, especially with regard to the liberal thinker Ștefan Zeletin and the socialist intellectual Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea: *Staulul și sirena*.
- 77 Vlad, *Imagini ale identității naționale: România și expozițiile universale de la Paris, 1867-1937*.
- 78 Along the same lines, Vlad continued tracing Romania's efforts to promote a favorable international image at the World Exhibitions in Belgium and in the French journal *L'Illustration*. See his *Pe urmele "Belgiei Orientului": România la expozițiile universale sau internaționale de la Anvers, Bruxelles, Liège și Gand, 1894-1935*; and *Ecouri românești în presa franceză: L'Illustration, 1843-1944*.
- 79 Livadă-Cadeschi, *De la milă la filantropie: Instituții de asistare a săracilor din Țara Românească și Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea*.
- 80 Djuvara, *Între Orient și Occident: Țările române la începutul epocii moderne, 1800-1848*.
- 81 Eliade, *Influența franceză asupra spiritului critic în România: Originile. Studiu asupra societății românești în vremea domniilor fanariote*.
- 82 Murgescu, *Între "bunul creștin" și "bravul român": Rolul școlii primare în construirea identității naționale românești, 1831-1878*.
- 83 Ciupală, *Femeia în societatea românească a secolului al XIX-lea: Între public și privat*.
- 84 His pre-1989 bibliography comprises numerous volumes dedicated to prominent Romanian historians, such as Mihail Kogălniceanu, A. D. Xenopol, Vasile Pârvan, Nicolae Iorga, and monographs on modern Romanian historiography.
- 85 From among these, one could mention *Istorie și finalitate; În orizontul istoriei; La sfârșit de ciclu; Impactul reîntregirii; Discurs istoric și tranziție: În căutarea unei paradigme*; and *Orizont închis: Istoriografia română sub dictatură*.
- 86 From among these one can mention *Culture and Society: Structure, Interferences, Analogies in the Modern Romanian Society* and *La Révolution Française et les Roumains: Impact, Images, Interpretations*.
- 87 See Antohi, *Utopica: Studii asupra imaginarului social*. Of Antohi's post-Communist publications, mostly valuable contributions to Romanian intellectual history, one should mention *Civitas Imaginalis: Istorie și utopie în cultura română* and *Exercițiul distanței: Discursuri, societăți, metode*. For more on Antohi's scholarship, see Murgescu, "The Romanian Historiography in the 1990s," 46-7, and Iordachi and Trencsényi, "In Search of a Usable Past," 40-2.
- 88 Historically, Bessarabia was a part of Moldavia, a historical Romanian province, but after 1812 it periodically changed its political status: from a Russian province up to 1918 into a Romanian one between the two World Wars, then a Soviet republic up to 1991, when it became an independent

state. Today, it is still inhabited by a large Romanian-speaking population, which, nevertheless, declares itself Moldovan.

- 89 Marx's writings on the Romanians discovered in Amsterdam secured irrefutable justification for the claims of the Moldovans' Romanianness. See Marx, *Însemnări despre români: Manuscrise inedite*. For the circumstances in which Marx's notes on the Romanians were published in Romania, see Țugui, *Istoria și limba română în vremea lui Gheorghiu-Dej: Memoriile unui fost șef de secție a CC al PMR*. The transcript of the Party meeting during which the publication was decided by Gheorghiu-Dej is in Betea, *Convorbiri neterminate: Corneliu Mănescu în dialog cu Lavinia Betea*, 293-4. Bessarabia was always part of Nicolae Ceaușescu's hidden agenda. He started by condemning the Cominternist theses regarding the multinational character of Greater Romania at the 45th anniversary of the Romanian Communist Party in May 1966. At the end of his rule, he condemned the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact at the 14th Congress of the RCP in November 1989. In fact, the supreme leader of the Romanian Communists brought up the Bessarabian issue whenever he considered it appropriate. He even allowed the publication of a study stating the fact that the union of 1918 was the will of the Romanian people on both sides of the river Prut. See Pascu, "Momente din lupta poporului român pentru formarea statului național unitar". Moreover, interviews with and writings of the members of the former *nomenklatura* reveal that even the old-timers did not believe in the idea that Bessarabia should belong to the Soviet Union, as stipulated in the theses of the 5th Congress of the Romanian Communist Party in 1931; see the opinions of Ion Gheorghe Maurer in Betea, *Maurer și lumea de ieri: Mărturii despre stalinizarea României*. See also the testimony of Paul Niculescu Mizil concerning his father's convictions in his *O istorie trăită*.
- 90 Solomon and Zub, eds., *Basarabia: Dilemele identității*.
- 91 Platon, *Geneza burgheziei în principatele române: A doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea-Prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea – Preliminariile unei istorii*.
- 92 Cojocaru, *Partida Națională și Constituirea Statului Român, 1856-1859*.
- 93 In Mihail Roller's interpretation, the 1859 union was determined by the intervention of external forces, especially France and Russia, and by the practical interests of the Romanian bourgeoisie looking for new markets. In his view, the opposing factor was the "reactionary aristocracy," who wanted the preservation of an old type of society and, thus, of their privileges. See Roller, *Probleme de istorie: Contribuții la lupta pentru o istorie științifică în R.P.R.*, 152-4.
- 94 See Mitu, *Geneza identității naționale la românii ardeleni*, translated as *National Identity of Romanians in Transylvania*.
- 95 See Toader Nicoară, *Transilvania la începuturile timpurilor moderne, 1680-1800: Societate rurală și mentalități colective*. This book, which represents his Ph.D. dissertation under the joint supervision of the University of Cluj and

- INALCO, Paris, has a French version published by L'Harmattan in 2002 with a preface by Catherine Durandin. The author's interest in the history of mentalities had produced two earlier volumes as well: an anthology and a book co-authored with Simona Nicoară, which provides an assessment of the *Annales* paradigm. See Nicoară and Nicoară, *Mentalități colective și imaginar social: Istoria și noile paradigme ale cunoașterii*.
- 96 Lucian Năstasă headed the team that edited a series of volumes of archival documents related to the main ethnic groups in post-Trianon Romania. Between 2001 and 2003, four volumes were edited by Năstasă and his collaborators in the Center for Resources for Ethno-Cultural Diversity in Cluj.
- 97 Năstasă, *Generație și schimbare în istoriografia română: Sfârșitul secolului XIX și începutul secolului XX*. Although historians from the younger generation have started to reflect upon the history of Romanian historiography, no comprehensive work has been published so far. Some important aspects, however, have been tackled in the following works: Pop, *O fenomenologie a gândirii istorice românești: Teoria și filozofia istoriei de la Hasdeu și Xenopol la Iorga și Blaga*; Murgescu, *A fi istoric în anul 2000*; and Mihalache, *Istorie și practici discursive în România "democrat-populară"*.
- 98 Năstasă, *Intelectualii și promovarea socială în România, sec. XIX-XX: Pentru o morfologie a cîmpului universitar*.
- 99 The list of publications is long. From among the various types of works in this category, one can mention Neagoe, *Istoria guvernelor României de la începuturi-1859 pînă în zilele noastre-1995*, which, despite its title, only includes a complete list of the structures of all governments from the period. A more elaborated work is Alexandrescu, Bulei, Mamina and Scurtu, *Enciclopedia partidelor politice din România, 1862-1994*, which comprises a short history of all political parties and, in appendix, the results of all elections, the membership of all governments and the electoral legislation in the period. Even members of the new generation followed this pattern; see Mihai Sorin Rădulescu, *Elita liberală românească, 1866-1900*, which is in fact a dictionary of the important members of the National Liberal Party.
- 100 See *Monarhia în România; Istoria Partidului Național Țărănesc*, in fact a revised edition of a book published under Communism; Iuliu Maniu: *Activitatea politică*; Ion Brătianu. His latest book represents an unsuccessful attempt to switch from political history to a kind of everyday life history: *Viața cotidiană a românilor în perioada interbelică*, for which he was also publicly denounced for plagiarism.
- 101 Scurtu and Bulei, *Democrația la români, 1866-1938*.
- 102 Alexandrescu, *Paradoxul român*.
- 103 See Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation-Building & Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930*; translated into Romanian as *Cultură și naționalism în România Mare, 1918-1930*.

- 104 For instance, it is striking that Apostol Stan carefully avoids any approach to the problem of the union of 1918, but discusses the passing of the laws regarding the agrarian reform and the granting of the universal suffrage, which occurred after the union. Stan, *Putere politică și democrație în România, 1859-1918*.
- 105 According to the "Instructions no. 1003/15 August 1968 regarding the classification, preservation and the circulation of library fonds" all the publications which contained ideas contrary to those promoted by the RCP and the government of the RSR were classified in a so-called special fond. Obviously, all the materials related to the Iron Guard were included into this category. The above mentioned instructions mentioned that the publications from the special fond could be read by well-known personalities with the approval of the library director, and by others only with a recommendation from the workplace or the university. If a good relation with the director of the library allowed many to read such materials, one must have been officially allowed to read them in order to publish something based on them. For more on the limitation of access to sensitive materials in libraries under Communism, see Costea, Király and Radosav, *Fond Secret. Fond S "Special": Contribuții la istoria fondurilor secrete de bibliotecă din România*.
- 106 A notable example in this respect is the book written by priest Ștefan Palaghiță, first published in 1951 in Argentina by the author. An adept of Corneliu Zelea Codreanu—who was assassinated before having the chance of getting to power—Palaghiță promotes a clearly partisan view. He accuses King Carol II, Horia Sima (Codreanu's successor to the leadership of the movement) and Marshal Antonescu of the destruction of the Iron Guard and its initial, in his opinion noble mission. See Palaghiță, *Garda de Fier spre reînvierea României*.
- 107 See for instance Milcoveanu, *Testamentul politic al lui Corneliu Z. Codreanu et al.* The author of this brochure is a deputy president of the League for the Defense of Truth, in fact a notorious former legionnaire and a current promoter of the cult of Codreanu.
- 108 See Heinen, *Die Legion "Erzengel Michael" in Rumänien. Soziale Bewegung und politische Organization: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus* and Veiga, *La mistica del ultranacionalismo: Historia de la Guardia del Hierro. Rumania, 1919-1941*.
- 109 Among those responsible for the rise of the Iron Guard, Petculescu deals with King Carol II, who attempted to become its leader; Iuliu Maniu, the president of the National Peasant Party, who made an electoral non-aggression pact with them; the liberal government of Gheorghe Tătărescu, in power between 1934 and 1937; chameleon-like politicians such as Constantin Argetoianu; and, especially, Marshal Antonescu, who effectively brought the Iron Guard into government in September 1940.
- 110 Ornea, *Anii treizeci: Extrema dreaptă românească*, translated into English as *The Romanian Extreme Right in the Nineteen Thirties*.

- 111 It should be noted that during late *Ceaușescuism* manifestations of anti-Semitism were allowed to surface in press through the voice of the most active “court poets,” the same persons who heavily contributed to the personality cult. The most illustrative example is the weekly *Săptămîna*, with its journalists Eugen Barbu and Corneliu Vadim Tudor. It is not by chance that the latter became the leader of the Greater Romania Party, the post-Communist right-wing party that promoted an anti-Semitic, anti-Hungarian, and pro-authoritarian rhetoric in the 1990s. Nevertheless, until the very end and in spite of its growing nationalism, the regime of Ceaușescu did not officially encourage anti-Semitism.
- 112 Karețki and Kovaci, *Zile însingurate la Iași, 29-30 iunie 1941*.
- 113 Simion, *Preliminarii politico-diplomatice ale insurecției române din august 1944*.
- 114 Buzatu, *România cu și fără Antonescu: Documente, relatări, studii și comentarii* and *România și războiul mondial din 1939-1945*.
- 115 See Shafir, *Între negare și trivializare prin comparație: Negarea Holocaustului în țările postcomuniste din Europa Centrală și de Est*.
- 116 Ioanid, *Evreii sub regimul Antonescu*. Ioanid is director of international archival programs at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C.
- 117 Between 1940 and 1944, the region of northern Transylvania was under Hungarian administration; therefore, the Jewish victims from that region cannot be added to the overall number of Romanian Jews who lost their lives during WWII. Obviously, this does not absolve the Romanian government with regard to what happened in the territories under Romanian administration.
- 118 Giurescu, *România în al doilea război mondial, 1939-1945*, translated into English as *Romania in World War II*.
- 119 See Ioanid, *Evreii sub regimul Antonescu*, 398-9.
- 120 See Ancel, *Transnistria*, vol. 3. 300-303.
- 121 Gabriel Andreescu is perhaps the most influential among the authors of relevant works. See, especially, his *Naționaliști, antinaționaliști...: O polemică în publicistica românească*, and *Ruleta: Români și maghiari, 1990-2000*.
- 122 See, for instance, Calafeteanu, *Revizionismul ungar și România*. Openly anti-Hungarian writings were also published. See, for instance, the volume—the authors of which are not specified—produced at the European Center for Historical Researches and Studies in Venice, sponsored by Iosif Constantin Drăgan. See 896 *e.n.*: *Mogyori=Ungaria*.
- 123 Mitu, *Geneza identității naționale la românii ardeleni*.
- 124 Trencsényi et al., *Nation-Building and Contested Identities: Romanian & Hungarian Case Studies*.
- 125 Năgler, *Românii și sașii pînă la 1848*. One should also note the publication of a new edition of Năgler’s book *Așezarea sașilor în Transilvania*, first published, in a limited edition, in 1979 in German, and in 1981 in

- Romanian. Some of the studies published abroad by the *Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde* (Association for Transylvanian Studies), established in 1962 in Germany are also published in Romanian—e.g. the volume *Transilvania și sașii ardeleni în istoriografie: Din publicațiile Asociației de Studii Transilvane Heidelberg*.
- 126 Achim, *Țigani în istoria României*.
 - 127 In this respect, the most systematic approach was taken by the Cluj-based Center for Resources and Cultural Diversity. The above-mentioned Lucian Năstasă, in cooperation with Andreea Andreescu and/or Andreea Varga, has published several carefully edited volumes of documents under the auspices of this center: *Țigani din România, 1919-1944* [Gypsies of Romania, 1919-1944] in 2001; *Maghiarii din România, 1945-1955* [Hungarians of Romania, 1945-1955] in 2002; *Evreii din România, 1945-1965* [Jews of Romania, 1945-1965] in 2003; *Maghiarii din România, 1956-1968* [Hungarians of Romania, 1956-1968] in 2003.
 - 128 One can find many articles, studies, and documents on Communist Romania in the monthly political science journal *Sfera politicii* [The Sphere of Politics], established in 1992. One should also note that political science was a brand-new discipline in post-Communist Romania; its advancement was determined by “converted” scholars, mainly historians and philosophers.
 - 129 Giurescu, (ed.), *Istoria României în date*.
 - 130 After 1989, several chronologies, concentrating mainly on the post-war period, were published. We could mention Marin Nedelea’s *Istoria României în date* and the volume *Instaurarea totalitarismului comunist în România*, edited by Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner, Daniela Bușe and Beatrice Marinescu, which covers the period between 23 August 1944 and 24 February 1948.
 - 131 Ionescu, *Communism in Romania: 1944-1962*; translated into Romanian as *Comunismul în România*.
 - 132 See his studies “The Tragicomedy of Romanian Communism,” in Feher and Arato, (eds.), *Crisis and Reform in Eastern Europe*, 121-174, and “From Arrogance to Irrelevance: Avatars of Marxism in Romania,” in Taras, ed., *The Road to Disillusion: From Critical Marxism to Postcommunism in Eastern Europe*, 135-150. Tismăneanu’s capital work on Romanian Communism, summing up his earlier contributions, is *Stalinism for All Seasons: A Political History of Romanian Communism*.
 - 133 One should also mention the importance of these authors in the establishing of political science as a distinct discipline in post-Communist Romania. Both Ionescu and Tismăneanu contributed to the establishment, in 1992, of the first Romanian political science journal, *Sfera politicii*, and were among its constant contributors.
 - 134 Tismăneanu, *Fantoma lui Gheorghiu-Dej*. Of his other works published in Romanian see especially *Arheologia terorii*; and *Noaptea totalitară*.

- 135 Deletant, *Ceausescu and the Securitate: Coercion and Dissent in Romania, 1965-1989*, translated into Romanian as *Ceaușescu și Securitatea*; Idem, *Communist Terror in Romania: Gheorghiu-Dej and the Police State, 1948-1965*, translated into Romanian as *Teroarea comunistă în România: Gheorghiu-Dej și statul polițienesc, 1948-1965*.
- 136 Verdery, *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania*; it is translated into Romanian as *Compromis și rezistență: Cultura română sub Ceaușescu*.
- 137 Kligman, *The Politics of Duplicity: Controlling Reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania*; the work is translated into Romanian as *Politica duplicității: Controlul nașterilor în România lui Ceaușescu*. See also Gal and Kligman, eds., *Reproducing Gender: Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*.
- 138 For example, see Giurescu, and Giurescu, *Istoria românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri și pînă astăzi*; and *Istoria ilustrată a Românilor*.
- 139 Giurescu, *The Razing of Romania's Past*; the work is translated into Romanian as *Distrugerea trecutului României*.
- 140 Giurescu, *Guvernarea Nicolae Rădescu*; the work is translated into English as *Romania's Communist Takeover: The Rădescu Government*.
- 141 Giurescu, *Uzurpatorii: România, 6 martie 1945-7 ianuarie 1946*.
- 142 Constantiniu, *Doi ori doi fac șaisprezece: A început Războiul Rece în România?*
- 143 Constantiniu, *P.C.R., Pătrășcanu și Transilvania, 1945-1946*.
- 144 Tănase, *Elite și societate: Guvernarea Gheorghiu-Dej, 1948-1965*.
- 145 Câmpeanu's *The Syncretic Society*, an original analysis of actualized Communism, was sent abroad and published by M. E. Sharpe in 1980 (under the pseudonym Felipe Garcia Casals). The Romanian version was published only recently. In the author's view, Stalinism was the only economic and social arrangement that offered stability to the syncretic society. This phrase designates prematurely implemented Socialism, like the Socialism envisaged by Lenin in Russia, based on political grounds rather than on historical evolution, as conceived by Marx. See Câmpeanu, *Societatea sincretică*.
- 146 Câmpeanu, *Ceaușescu: Anii numărătorii inverse*.
- 147 Cioroianu, *Ce Ceaușescu qui hante les Roumains: Le Mythe, les représentations et le culte du Dirigeant dans la Roumanie communiste*.
- 148 Șperlea, *De la armata regală la armata populară: Sovietizarea armatei române, 1948-1955*.
- 149 Vasile, *Între Vatican și Kremlin: Biserica Greco-Catolică în timpul regimului comunist*.
- 150 Ciobanu, *Convorbiri cu Mihai I al României*.
- 151 See Coposu, *Dialoguri cu Vartan Arachelian* and idem, *Confesiuni: Dialoguri cu Doina Alexandru*.
- 152 See, for instance, the testimonies related to the deportations from the Banat to Bărăgan, a sort of Romanian Siberia in the early 1950s. See

- Marineasa and Vighi, (eds.), *Rusalii '51: Fragmente din deportarea în Bărăgan*, and Vultur, *Istorie trăită—istorie povestită: Deportarea în Bărăgan, 1951-1956*. Regarding the German minority in the Banat, see Smaranda Vultur, ed., *Germanii din Banat prin povestirile lor*. The Civic Academy Foundation has also established an oral history archive within the Sighet Memorial of the Victims of Communism and Resistance.
- 153 Sănătescu was the military commander of Bucharest during the Iron Guard's rebellion of January 1941 and Prime Minister in two of the successive governments that followed the coup of 23 august 1944 (23 August – 2 November and 4 November – 2 December 1944).
- 154 See Sănătescu, *Ţurnal*.
- 155 Berindei, "Profesorul, istoricul, omul politic, memorialistul Ioan Hudiţă, 1896-1982)" 4. The first volume of his diary, concerning the year 1944, was published in 1997. See Hudiţă, *Ţurnal politic, 1 ianuarie – 24 august 1944*. Other three volumes, covering the period January 1940 – June 1941 have been subsequently published. Hudiţă, *Ţurnal politic, 7 septembrie 1940 – 8 februarie 1941* 2 vols., and idem, *Ţurnal politic, 9 februarie – 21 iunie 1941*.
- 156 Ion Ioanid was imprisoned for the first time in 1949. Released after a short period and imprisoned again in 1952, he was definitively liberated in 1964. In 1969 he emigrated to Germany and became one of the well-known voices of Radio Free Europe's Romanian desk. Ioanid, *Închisoarea noastră cea de toate zilele*.
- 157 Cesianu, *Salvat din infern*.
- 158 Baghiu, *Printre gratii*.
- 159 In fact, Zilber wrote his memoirs in two versions. The first version of his memoirs was confiscated by *Securitate* agents in May 1970 and was recovered and published some years after the fall of Communist regime. See Zilber, *Actor în procesul Pătrăşcanu: Prima versiune a memoriilor lui Belu Zilber*. Zilber, however, wrote a second version as well, which was published shortly after the 1989 revolution, under a pseudonym. See Şerbulescu, *Monarhia de drept dialectic: A doua versiune a memoriilor lui Belu Zilber*. Lucreţiu Pătrăşcanu was one of the very few intellectuals who joined the Communist Party before the Communist takeover. Arrested in 1948, he was executed in prison in 1954, on Gheorghiu-Dej's orders, who saw a redoubtable rival and a possible successor in him, especially after Stalin's death. A close collaborator of Pătrăşcanu, Zilber was arrested and used by the Communist authorities in staging the Pătrăşcanu trial. For more on the Pătrăşcanu case see Răduică, *Crime în lupta pentru putere, 1966-1968: Ancheta cazului Pătrăşcanu*.
- 160 Pandrea, *Memoriile mandarinului valah*.
- 161 Goma, *Ţurnal* 3 vols. See also Goma, *Alte jurnale*. Apart from his diary, Goma has written at length on his dissidence and his anti-Communist actions while in exile in a series of volumes. See *Soldatul ciinelui*; idem,

- Amnezia la români*; idem, *Culoarea curcubeului '77: Cutremurul oamenilor*; idem, *Scrisori întredeschise: Singur împotriva lor* and idem, *Scrisuri*.
- 162 Albu, *Zidul martor: Pagini de jurnal, 1970-1990*.
- 163 Tănase, *Acasă se vorbește în șoaptă*. A complete version of Tănase's diary was published as *Ora oficială de iarnă: Jurnal*.
- 164 Popa, *Robi pe Uranus*.
- 165 For instance, Tia Șerbănescu's diary, *Femeia din fotografie: Jurnal, 1987-1989*, contains some memorable pages on journalism under late Ceaușescuism. A parallel with that provided by Boris Buzilă, her more conformist fellow journalist at the daily newspaper *România liberă*, who has also published his journal, *În prezența stăpînilor: Treizeci de ani de jurnal secret la România liberă*. Vasile Gogea's journal, *Fragmente salvate, 1975-1989* speaks of the intellectual life in the city of Brașov and the 1987 Brașov workers revolt, while Liviu Antonesei's, *Jurnal din anii ciurmei, 1987-1989: Încercări de sociologie spontană*, provides interesting details on dissidence in the city of Iași during the 1980s. One should also mention Alexandru Tatos's diary, *Pagini de jurnal* which speaks of filmmaking and the conditions of a film director under the Ceaușescu regime. With regard to the medical profession under Communism, surgeon Dumitru Pascu has written insightful, critical pages in his diary, *Operație fără anestezie: Din amintirile și speranțele unui chirurg*.
- 166 Concerning the issue of co-optation by the regime, Prodan is particularly critical towards the Cluj-based historians Constantin Daicoviciu and Ștefan Pascu, whose prominent careers he could follow closely. See Prodan, *Memorii*.
- 167 Giurescu, *Cinci ani și două luni în penitenciarul de la Sighet, 7 mai 1950 - 5 iulie 1955*. A completely revised version of Giurescu's memoirs was published as *Amintiri*. Actually, C. C. Giurescu published a shortened version of his memoirs in 1976, which, for obvious reasons, did not include the Sighet prison episode. See Giurescu, *Amintiri*. For more on the personality of C. C. Giurescu, see the volume jointly edited by the Romanian Academy and the Faculty of History, Philosophy, and Geography at the University of Craiova, *Centenar Constantin C. Giurescu*.
- 168 See *Oglinzi retrovizoare: Istorie, memorie și morală în România*. Alexandru Zub in dialog cu Sorin Antohi. Antohi has realized two other similar volumes, focusing on issues of cultural and intellectual history: *Al treilea discurs: Cultură, ideologie și politică în România*. Adrian Marino in dialog cu Sorin Antohi and *Mai avem un viitor? România la început de mileniu*. Mihai Șora in dialog cu Sorin Antohi.
- 169 Constantinescu, *100 de istorioare cu istoricii Epocii de Aur*.
- 170 See Bernard, *Aici e Europa Liberă*; Carp, "Vocea Americii" în *România, 1969-1978*; Stroescu-Stănișoară, *În zodia exilului: Fragmente de jurnal*; Lovinescu, *La apa Vavilonului* 2, 1960-1980; Idem, *Unde scurte. Jurnal indirect*; Idem, *Unde scurte II. Seismograme*; Idem, *Unde scurte III. Posterii*.

- tatea contemporana*; Idem, *Unde scurte IV. Est-etice*; Idem, *Unde scurte V. Pragul*; Idem, *Unde scurte VI. Insula Șerpilor* Gabanyi, *The Ceaușescu Cult*.
- 171 Petrescu and Cangeopol, *Ce-ar mai fi de spus: Convorbiri libere într-o țară ocupată*.
- 172 See Botez, *Lumea a doua*. Among Botez's other dissident writings, published in Romania only after the collapse of Communism, one can mention *Intellectualii din Europa de Est* and *Românii despre ei înșiși*.
- 173 It is interesting to note that Dej's men picture the period of their patron almost exclusively in terms of achievements, above all standing the struggle for achieving full independence from Moscow. Their problem is to underline that it was Dej, who must be credited as the artisan of the emancipation from the Soviet hegemony, and not Ceaușescu, who, nevertheless, with the speech on August 1968, obscured the merits of his predecessor. Moreover, all Dej's men interpret the history of the Communist party from the late 1940s to the late 1950s as a confrontation between a national faction, conducted by Dej himself, which defended the interests of the country, and a Muscovite faction, Soviet-oriented, to which belonged all those who were purged. Such an interpretation belongs, actually, to Dej himself. He made his vision plain at the Plenum of the Central Committee held in November 1961 by stating that the purges of 1952 (the Pauker-Luca-Teohari Georgescu faction) and 1957 (the Constantinescu-Chișinevski group) were the result of a struggle between the proponents of two divergent policies: the locals (*pămînteni*) and the Muscovites.
- 174 For Apostol's account, see Betea, *Maurer și lumea de ieri: Mărturii despre stalinizarea României*.
- 175 Betea, *Convorbiri neterminate: Corneliu Mănescu în dialog cu Lavinia Betea*.
- 176 The former, an economist by training and a member of the Communist party since 1936, held, between 1955 and 1966, the positions of First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers in charge with economic issues and that of Romania's representative to COMECON. The latter, an engineer educated in Grenoble and a member of the French resistance under the Vichy government, had a successful career in Dej's Romania, being promoted up to the positions of Chairman of the State Committee for Planning (1954-1965) and Vice President of the Council of Ministers (1962-1969).
- 177 Mizil even felt the need to come up with a second book in which he concentrates on the international debates concerning the right of each Communist party to devise its own, "national" path to Communism and underlines, once again, that the major policy directions traced by Dej remained unchanged under Ceaușescu. See Niculescu-Mizil, *De la Comintern la comunism național*. As head of the Propaganda Section of the Central Committee, Mizil's account of the publication of Karl Marx's *Notes on the Romanians*, and on the controversy with the Soviet historians on the significance of the 23 August 1944—which was reinterpreted as

- an internally driven action instead of a Soviet-backed one—are of prime value for the history of communist historiography.
- 178 Sfetcu, *13 ani în anticamera lui Dej*.
 - 179 Serviciul Român de Informații (Romanian Intelligence Service), *Cartea Albă Securității*; idem, *Cartea Albă a Securității: Istorii literare și artistice, 1969–1989*.
 - 180 Examples of such volumes are Pelin, ed., *Operațiunile “Melița” și “Eterul:” Istoria Europei Libere prin documente de Securitate*; Idem, *Opisul emigrației politice: Destine în 1222 de fișe alcătuite pe baza dosarelor din arhivele Securității*. Of the numerous collections of documents concentrating solely on the communist period in Romania one can mention: Scurtu, ed., *1945—România: Viața politică în documente*; Idem, *1946—România: Viața politică în documente*; Idem, *1947—România: Viața politică în documente*; Lungu and Retegan, (eds.), *1956—Explozia: Percepții române, iugoslave și sovietice asupra evenimentelor din Polonia și Ungaria*; Arhivele Militare Române, *Armata română în revoluția din decembrie 1989: Studiu documentar*, (ed.), *Timișoara în arhivele “Europei Libere”*—17–20 Decembrie 1989. A comprehensive list of such volumes is provided in the bibliography.
 - 181 See, for instance, Tudoran, *Kakistocrația*.
 - 182 Preda and Retegan, (eds.), *1989—Principiul dominoului: Prăbușirea regimurilor comuniste europene*.
 - 183 See Mitu (coord.), hereafter cited as “the Sigma textbook.”
 - 184 Preda, “Acuz!”
 - 185 See Mitu (coord.), *Istorie*. The other four alternative history textbooks were: Bozgan, Lazăr, Stamatescu, and Teodorescu, *Istorie*; Dumitrescu, Manea, Niță, Pascu, Trandafir, and Trandafir, *Istoria Românilor*; Scurtu, Curculescu, Dincă, and Soare, *Istoria Românilor*; Brezeanu, Cioroianu, Müller, Rădulescu, and Retegan, *Istorie*.
 - 186 For instance, the Petrică textbook provides a misleading interpretation of communist Romania’s “Declaration of Independence” from Moscow, that is, the Declaration of April 1964. In fact, the Petrică textbook commits a fundamental error by presenting this document in a way that leads to the false conclusion that it was a crucial document of reform communism in Romania, while in reality it was the document that proclaimed the victory of Gheorghiu-Dej’s strategy to oppose de-Stalinization and remain in power. See the Petrică textbook, 215, 255.
 - 187 Although they provide modern interpretations of some sensitive topics, they address equally important topics following the lines of the nationalistic historiography. In the case of the Rao textbook, compare the misleading definition of the Antonescu regime as a “wartime regime” (see the Rao textbook, 199) with the perceptive approach to dissidence under the Ceaușescu regime (see the Rao textbook, 256–257).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Viorel Achim, *Țiganii în istoria României* [Gypsies in Romania's History] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998)
- Florența Albu, *Zidul martor: Pagini de jurnal, 1970–1990* [The Witnessing Wall: Pages of a Diary, 1970–1990] (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1994)
- Ion Alexandrescu, Ion Bulei, Ion Mamina, and Ioan Scurtu, *Enciclopedia partidelor politice din România, 1862–1994* [The Encyclopedia of Political Parties in Romania, 1862–1994] (Bucharest: Editura Mediaprint, 1995)
- Sorin Alexandrescu, *Paradoxul român* [The Romanian Paradox] (Bucharest: Univers, 1998)
- Jean Ancel, *Transnistria*, vol. 3 (Bucharest: Atlas, 1998)
- Gabriel Andreescu, *Naționalisti, antinaționalisti...: O polemică în publicistica românească* [Nationalists, Anti-Nationalists...: A Polemic in the Romanian Press] (Iași: Polirom, 1996)
- Gabriel Andreescu, *Ruleta: Români și maghiari, 1990–2000* [The Roulette: Romanians and Hungarians, 1990–2000] (Iași: Polirom, 2001)
- Ștefan Andreescu, *Vlad Țepeș: Dracula* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2nd rev. ed. 1998)
- Ștefan Andreescu, *Perspective medievale* [Medieval perspectives] (Bucharest: Nemira, 2002)
- Sorin Antohi, *Utopica: Studii asupra imaginarului social* [Utopica: Studies in the Social Imaginary] (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1991)
- Sorin Antohi, *Civitas Imaginalis: Istorie și utopie în cultura română* [Civitas Imaginalis: History and Utopia in the Romanian Culture] (Bucharest: Litera, 1994)
- Sorin Antohi, *Exercițiul distanței: Discursuri, societăți, metode* [Exercise in Distancing: Discourses, Societies, Methods] (Bucharest: Nemira, 1997)
- Sorin Antohi, *Al treilea discurs: Cultură, ideologie și politică în România. Adrian Marino în dialog cu Sorin Antohi* [The Third Discourse: Culture, Ideology and Politics in Romania. Adrian Marino in Dialogue with Sorin Antohi] (Iași: Polirom, 2000)
- Sorin Antohi, *Mai avem un viitor? România la început de mileniu. Mihai Șora în dialog cu Sorin Antohi* [Do We Still Have a Future? Romania at the Beginning of a New Millennium. Mihai Șora in Dialogue with Sorin Antohi] (Iași: Polirom, 2001)
- Sorin Antohi, *Oglinzi retrovizoare: Istorie, memorie și morală în România. Alexandru Zub în dialog cu Sorin Antohi* [Rear Reflecting Mirrors: History, Memory and Morality in Romania. Alexandru Zub in Dialogue with Sorin Antohi] (Iași: Polirom, 2002)
- Liviu Antonesei, *Jurnal din anii ciumei, 1987–1989: Încercări de sociologie spontană* [Diary from the Years of the Plague, 1987–1989: Attempts at a Spontaneous Sociology] (Iași: Polirom, 1995)

- Arhivele Militare Române, *Armata română în revoluția din decembrie 1989: Studiu documentar* [The Romanian Army in the 1989 Revolution: A Documentary Study] (Bucharest: Editura Militară, 1998)
- Adolf Armbruster, *Romanitatea românilor: Istoria unei idei* [The Romanians' Romanness: The History of an Idea] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993)
- Aurel Baghiu, *Printre gratii* [Through the Bars] (Cluj: Editura Zamolxis, 1995)
- Nicolae Bălcescu, *Românii supt Mihai-Voievod Viteazul* [The Romanians under Michael-Voivode the Brave] (Bucharest: Minerva, 1977)
- Daniel Barbu, *Scrisoare pe nisip: Timpul și privirea în civilizația românească a secolului al XVIII-lea* [Letter in the Sand: Time and Perception in the Romanian Civilization of the 18th century] (Bucharest: Editura Antet, 1996)
- Daniel Barbu, *Manuscrise bizantine în colecțiile din România* [Byzantine Manuscripts in Romanian Collections] (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1984)
- Daniel Barbu, *Pictura murală din Țara Românească în secolul al XIV-lea* [Mural Paintings in Wallachia of the 14th Century] (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1986)
- Daniel Barbu, *Bizanț contra Bizanț: Explorări în cultura politică românească* [Byzance against Byzance: A Quest for Romanian Political Culture] (Bucharest: Nemira, 2001).
- Daniel Barbu, *Byzance, Rome et les Roumains: Essais sur la production politique de la foi au Moyen Âge* (Bucharest: Babel, 1998)
- Daniel Barbu, *Republica absentă: Politică și societate în România postcomunistă* [The Absent Republic: Politics and Society in post-Communist Romania] (Bucharest: Nemira, 1999; reprint 2004)
- Daniel Barbu, *O arheologie constituțională românească: Studii și documente* [A Romanian Constitutional Archeology: Studies and Documents] (Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 2000)
- Mihai Bărbulescu, Dennis Deletant, Keith Hitchins, Șerban Papacostea, and Pompiliu Teodor, *Istoria României* [The History of Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Corint, 2002)
- Ligia Bârză and Stelian Brezeanu, *Originea și continuitatea românilor: Arheologie și tradiție istorică* [The Origins and Continuity of the Romanians: Archaeology and Historical Tradition] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1991)
- Dan Berindei, "Profesorul, istoricul, omul politic, memorialistul Ioan Hudiță, 1896–1982" [Professor, Historian, Politician, Memoirist Ioan Hudiță, 1896–1982], in *Dosarele istoriei* [Dossiers of History] No.7 (2002), 4.
- Dan Berindei and Virgil Cândea eds., *Istoria Românilor* [The History of the Romanians] vols. I–IV (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2001)
- Noel Bernard, *Aici e Europa Libera* [This is Radio Free Europe] (Bucharest: Tinerama, 1991)
- Lavinia Betea, *Maurer și lumea de ieri: Mărturii despre stalinizarea României* [Maurer and Yesterday's World: Testimonies on Romania's Stalinization] (Arad: Editura Ioan Slavici, 1995)

- Lavinia Betea, *Alexandru Bârlădeanu despre Dej, Ceaușescu și Iliescu: Convorbiri* [Alexandru Bârlădeanu on Dej, Ceaușescu and Iliescu: Conversations] (Bucharest: Editura Evenimentul Românesc, 1998)
- Lavinia Betea, *Convorbiri neterminate: Corneliu Mănescu în dialog cu Lavinia Betea* [Unfinished conversations: Corneliu Mănescu in dialogue with Lavinia Betea] (Iași: Polirom, 2001)
- Lucian Boia, *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1997)
- Lucian Boia, *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001)
- Lucian Boia, *Joacă cu trecutul: Istoria între adevăr și ficțiune* [Playing with the Past: History between Truth and Fiction] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1998)
- Lucian Boia, *L'Exploration imaginaire de l'espace* (Paris: La Découverte, 1987)
- Lucian Boia, *La fin du monde: Une histoire sans fin* (Paris: La Découverte, 1989)
Romanian translation: Bucharest: Humanitas, 1999.
- Lucian Boia, *La Mythologie scientifique du communisme* (Caen-Orléans: Paradigme, 1993), second edition, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000. Romanian translation: Bucharest: Humanitas, 1999.
- Lucian Boia, *Entre L'Ange et la Bête: Le Mythe de l'Homme différent de l'Antiquité à nos jours* (Paris: Plon, 1995)
- Lucian Boia, *Pour une histoire de l'imaginaire* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998)
- Lucian Boia, *Pour vivre deux cents ans: Essai sur le mythe de la longévité* (Paris: In Press, 1998)
- Lucian Boia, *Le Mythe de la Démocratie* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002)
- Lucian Boia, *Romania: Borderland of Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001)
- Lucian Boia, *România, țară de frontieră a Europei* (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 2001)
- Lucian Boia, ed., *Mituri istorice românești* [Romanian Historical Myths] (Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 1995)
- Lucian Boia, ed., *Miturile comunismului românesc* [Myths of Romanian Communism] 2 vols. (Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 1995 and 1997)
- Lucian Boia, *Miturile comunismului românesc* [Myths of Romanian Communism] (Bucharest: Nemira, 1998)
- Mihai Botez, *Lumea a doua* [The Second World] (Bucharest: Du Style, 1997)
- Mihai Botez, *Intellectualii din Europa de Est* [Intellectuals of Eastern Europe] (Bucharest: Editura Fundatiei Culturale Române, 1993)
- Mihai Botez, *Românii despre ei înșiși* [Romanians about Themselves] (Bucharest: Litera, 1992)
- Ovidiu Bozgan, Liviu Lazăr, Mihai Stamatescu, and Bogdan Teodorescu, *Istorie* [History] (Bucharest: All Educational, 1999)
- Stelian Brezeanu, *Romanitatea orientală în evul mediu: De la cetățenii romani la națiunea medievală* [Oriental Romanity during the Middle Ages: From Roman Citizenship to the Medieval Nation] (Bucharest: All, 1999)
- Stelian Brezeanu, Adrian Cioroianu, Florin Müller, Mihai-Sorin Rădulescu, and Mihai Retegan, *Istorie* [History] (Bucharest: Rao, 1999)

- Ion Bulei, *Scurtă istorie a românilor* [A Short History of the Romanians] (Bucharest: Editura Meronia, 1996)
- Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives in Historical Writing* (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991)
- Boris Buzilă, *În prezența stăpînurilor: Treizeci de ani de jurnal secret la România liberă* [In the Presence of the Masters: Thirty Years of Secret Diary at *România liberă*] (Bucharest: Editura Compania, 1999)
- Ion Calafeteanu, *Revizionismul ungar și România* [Hungarian Revisionism and Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1995)
- Pavel Câmpeanu, *Societatea sincretică* [The Syncretic Society] (Iași: Editura Polirom, 2002)
- Pavel Câmpeanu, *Ceaușescu: Anii numărătorii inverse* [Ceaușescu: The Countdown Years] (Iași: Polirom, 2002)
- Mircea Carp, "Vocea Americii" în România, 1969–1978 ["Voice of America" in Romania, 1969–1978] (Iași: Polirom, 1997)
- Nicolae Ceaușescu, "P.C.R. continuator al luptei revoluționare și democratice al poporului român, al tradițiilor muncitorești și socialiste" [The Romanian Communist Party, Follower of the Revolutionary and Democratic Struggle of the Romanian People, of the Workers' and Socialist Movement] in *România pe drumul desăvîșirii socialiste* [Romania on the Road to Socialist Accomplishment] vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1968)
- Centenar Constantin C. Giurescu* [Constantin C. Giurescu: A Centennial Commemoration] (Craiova: Editura Universitaria, 2001)
- Rodica Chelaru, *Culpe care nu se uită: Convorbiri cu Cornel Burtică* [Sins One Cannot Forget: Conversations with Cornel Burtică] (Bucharest: Editura Curtea Veche, 2001)
- Constantin Cesianu, *Salvat din infern* [Saved from Inferno] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1992)
- Mircea Ciobanu, *Convorbiri cu Mihai I al României* [Conversations with Michael I of Romania] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1991)
- Alin Ciupală, *Femeia în societatea românească a secolului al XIX-lea: Între public și privat* [The Woman in the Romanian society of the 19th Century: Between Public and Private] (Bucharest: Meridiane, 2003)
- Mihai Cojocaru, *Partida Națională și Constituirea Statului Român, 1856–1859* [The National Political Group and the Establishment of the Romanian State, 1856–1859] (Iași: Iași University Press, 1995)
- Miron Constantinescu et al., *Istoria României: Compendiu* [The History of Romania: A Compendium] (Bucharest: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1969)
- Radu Constantinescu, *100 de istorioare cu istoricii Epocii de Aur* [100 short stories with Golden Epoch's historians] (Iași: Editura Fides, 1997)
- Florin Constantiniu, *O istorie sinceră a poporului român* [A Sincere History of the Romanian People] (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 1997)

- Florin Constantiniu, *Doi ori doi fac șaisprezece: A început Războiul Rece în România?* [Two Multiplied by Two Make Sixteen: Did the Cold War Start in Romania?] (Bucharest: Eurosong & Book, 1997)
- Florin Constantiniu, *P.C.R., Pătrășcanu și Transilvania, 1945–1946* [The RCP, Pătrășcanu and Transylvania, 1945–1946] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2001)
- Doina Cornea, *Scrisori deschise și alte texte* [Open Letters and Other Texts] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1991)
- Ionuț Costea, István Király and Doru Radosav, *Fond Secret. Fond S “Special”: Contribuții la istoria fondurilor secrete de bibliotecă din România* [Secret Fond. Fond S “Special:” Contributions to the History of Secret Library Fonds from Romania] (Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1995)
- Corneliu Coposu, *Dialoguri cu Vartan Arachelian* [Dialogues with Vartan Arachelian] (Bucharest: Editura Anastasia, 1991)
- Corneliu Coposu, *Confesiuni: Dialoguri cu Doina Alexandru* [Confessions: Dialogues with Doina Alexandru] (Bucharest: Editura Anastasia, 1996)
- Ovidiu Cristea, *Acest domn de la miazănoapte: Ștefan cel Mare în documente inedite venețiene* [This Senior from the North: Stephen the Great in Unedited Venetian Documents] (Bucharest: Corint, 2004)
- Silviu Curticeanu, *Mărturia unei istorii trăite: Imagini suprapuse* [Testimony of a Lived History: Overlapping images] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 2000)
- Vasile C. Dumitrescu, *O istorie a exilului românesc, 1944–1989* [A History of the Romanian Exile, 1944–1989] (Bucharest: Editura Victor Frunză, 1997)
- Constantin Daicoviciu et al., eds., *Istoria României* [The History of Romania], 4 vols. (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne, 1960–1964)
- Dennis Deletant, *Ceausescu and the Securitate: Coercion and Dissent in Romania, 1965–1989* (London: Hurst & Company, 1995)
- Dennis Deletant, *Ceaușescu și Securitatea* (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1998)
- Dennis Deletant, *Communist Terror in Romania: Gheorghiu-Dej and the Police State, 1948–1965* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999)
- Dennis Deletant, *Teroarea comunistă în România: Gheorghiu-Dej și statul polițienesc, 1948–1965* (Iași: Editura Polirom, 2001)
- Neagu Djuvara, *Între Orient și Occident: Țările române la începutul epocii moderne, 1800–1848* [Between Orient and Occident: The Romanian Principalities at the Beginning of Modern Times, 1800–1848] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1995)
- Neagu Djuvara, *O scurtă istorie a românilor povestită celor tineri* [A Brief History of the Romanians, Narrated to the Youth] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1999)
- Neagu Djuvara, *Amintiri din pribegie, 1948–1990* [Memoirs from Exile, 1948–1990] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros 2002)
- Ioan Drăgan, *Nobilimea românească din Transilvania: 1440–1514* [The Romanian Nobility from Transylvania: 1440–1514] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2000)

- Iosif Constantin Drăgan, *Antonescu: Mareșalul României și războaiele de întregire* [Antonescu: Romania's Marshall and the Unification Wars] (n.p.: Fundația Europeană Drăgan, 1990)
- Iosif Constantin Drăgan, *Istoria românilor* [The History of the Romanians] (Bucharest: Editura Europa Nova, 1999)
- Iosif Constantin Drăgan, *896 e.n.: Mogyoria=Ungaria* [896 A.D.: Mogyoria=Hungary] (Bucharest: Editura Europa Nova, 2000)
- Nicoleta Dumitrescu, Mihai Manea, Cristian Niță, Adrian Pascu, Aurel Trandafir, and Mădălina Trandafir, *Istoria Românilor* [History of the Romanians] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1999)
- Vasile C. Dumitrescu, *O istoria a exilului românesc, 1944–1989* [A history of the Romanian exile] (Bucharest: Editura Victor Frunză, 1997).
- Alexandru Duțu, *Cărțile de înțelepciune în cultura română* [The Books of Wisdom in Romanian Culture] (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1972)
- Alexandru Duțu, *Eseu în istoria modelelor umane: Imaginea omului în literatură și pictură* [An Essay in the History of Models: The Image of Man in Literature and Arts] (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1972)
- Alexandru Duțu, *Alexândria ilustrată de Năstase Negrule* [The Story of Alexander the Great with Illustrations by Năstase Negrule] (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 1986)
- Alexandru Duțu, *Dimensiunea umană a istoriei* [The Human Dimension of History] (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 1986)
- Alexandru Duțu, *Ideea de Europa și evoluția conștiinței europene* [The Idea of Europe and the Evolution of European Consciousness] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1999)
- Alexandru Duțu and Norbert Dodille, eds., *Culture et politique* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1995)
- Pompiliu Eliade, *Influența franceză asupra spiritului critic în România: Originile. Studiu asupra societății românești în vremea domniilor fanariote* [The French Influence on the Critical Spirit in Romania: The Origins. A Study on Romanian Society During the Time of the Phanariot Regime] (Bucharest: Editura Univers, 1982)
- Cristina Feneșan, *Constituirea principatului autonom al Transilvaniei* [The Establishment of the Autonomous Transylvanian Principality] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1997)
- Victor Frunză, *Istoria stalinismului în România* [A History of Stalinism in Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1990)
- Anneli Ute Gabanyi, *The Ceaușescu Cult* (Bucharest: The Romanian Cultural Foundation Publishing House, 2000)
- Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, eds., *Reproducing Gender: Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000)
- Vlad Georgescu, *Politică și istorie: Cazul comuniștilor români, 1944–1977* [Politics and History: The Case of Romanian Communists, 1944–1977] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1991)

- Vlad Georgescu, *The Romanians: A History* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1991)
- Vlad Georgescu, *Istoria românilor: De la origini până în zilele noastre* [The History of the Romanians: From the Origins to the Present] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1992)
- Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, *40 de ani de luptă sub steagul biruitor al marxism-leninismului* [40 Years of Struggle under the Victorious Banner of Marxism-Leninism] (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1961)
- Constantin C. Giurescu, ed., *Istoria României în date* [Romania's History in Data] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1972)
- Constantin C. Giurescu, *Amintiri* [Memoirs] (Bucharest: Editura Sport-Turism, 1976)
- Constantin C. Giurescu, *Cinci ani și două luni în penitenciarul de la Sighet, 7 mai 1950 – 5 iulie 1955* [Five Years and Two Month in the Sighet Penitentiary, 7 May 1950 – 5 July 1955] (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1994)
- Constantin C. Giurescu, *Amintiri* [Memoirs] (Bucharest: Editura All, 2000)
- Constantin C. Giurescu and Dinu C. Giurescu, *Istoria Românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri și până astăzi* [The History of the Romanians from the Most Ancient Times until Today] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1971)
- Constantin C. Giurescu, *Istoria ilustrată a Românilor* (An Illustrated History of the Romanians) (Bucharest: Editura Sport-Turism, 1985)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *Romania's Communist Takeover: The Rădescu Government* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1994)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *Guvernarea Nicolae Rădescu* [The Nicolae Rădescu Government] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1996)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *România în al doilea război mondial, 1939–1945* [Romania During the Second World War, 1939–1945] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1999)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *Romania in World War II* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2000)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *Uzurpatorii: România, 6 martie 1945–7 ianuarie 1946* [The Usurpers: Romania, 6 March 1945–7 January 1946] (Bucharest: Editura Vremea, 2004)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *The Razing of Romania's Past* (Washington D.C.: The Preservation Press, 1989)
- Dinu C. Giurescu, *Distrușgerea trecutului României* [The Destruction of Romania's Past] (Bucharest: Editura Museion, 1994)
- Vasile Gogea, *Fragmente salvate, 1975–1989* [Saved Fragments, 1975–1989] (Iasi: Editura Polirom, 1996)
- Paul Goma, *Jurnal* [Diary] 3 vols. (Bucharest: Nemira, 1997)
- Paul Goma, *Alte jurnale* [Other Diaries] (Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1998)
- Paul Goma, *Soldatul cînelui* [Soldier's Dog] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1991)
- Paul Goma, *Amnezia la români* [Amnesia to the Romanians] (Bucharest: Litera, 1992)

- Paul Goma, *Culoarea curcubeului '77: Cutremurul oamenilor* [The Color of the Rainbow '77: The Earthquake of the People] (Oradea: Multiprint, 1993)
- Paul Goma, *Scrisori întredeschise: Singur împotriva lor* [Half-opened Letters: Alone against Them] (Oradea: Multiprint, 1995)
- Paul Goma, *Scrisuri* [Writings] (Bucharest: Nemira, 1999)
- Ștefan Gorovei, *Întemeierea Moldovei: Probleme controversate* [The Foundation of Moldavia: Controversial Problems] (Iași: Iași University Press, 1997)
- François Guizot, *L'histoire de France depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1789: Racontée a mes petits-enfants*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1882)
- Armin Heinen, *Die Legion "Erzengel Michael" in Rumänien. Soziale Bewegung und politische Organization: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986)
- Ioan Hudiță, *Jurnal politic, 1 ianuarie – 24 august 1944* [Political Journal, 1 January – 24 August 1944] (Bucharest: Editura Roza Vinturilor, 1997)
- Ioan Hudiță, *Jurnal politic, 7 septembrie 1940 – 8 februarie 1941* [Political Journal, 7 September 1940 – 8 February 1941] 2 vols. (Iași: Institutul European, 2000)
- Ioan Hudiță, *Jurnal politic, 9 februarie – 21 iunie 1941* [Political Journal, 9 February – 21 June 1941] (Iași: Institutul European, 2002)
- Ion Ioanid, *Închisoarea noastră cea de toate zilele* [Our Everyday Prison] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1991: vols. 1–2, 1992: vol. 3; 1994: vol. 4, 1996: vol. 5)
- Radu Ioanid, *Evreii sub regimul Antonescu* [The Jews under the Antonescu Regime] (Bucharest: Editura Hasefer, 1997)
- Ghiță Ionescu, *Communism in Romania: 1944–1962* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- Ghiță Ionescu, *Comunismul în România* (Bucharest: Editura Litera, 1994)
- Anastase Iordache, *Criza politică din România și războaiele balcanice, 1911–1913* [The Political Crisis in Romania and the Balkan wars, 1911–1913] (Bucharest: Editura Paideia, 1998)
- Anastase Iordache, *Parlamentul României în anii reformelor și ai primului război mondial, 1907–1918* [The Romanian Parliament in the Years of Reforms and of WWI] (Bucharest: Editura Paideia, 2001)
- Constantin Iordachi and Balázs Trencsényi, "In Search of a Usable Past: The Question of National Identity in Romanian Studies, 1990–2000" in *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Fall 2003), pp. 415–453
- Nicolae Jurca, *Istoria social-democrației din România* [A History of Social Democracy in Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1994)
- Aurel Kereki and Maria Kovaci, *Zile însângerate la Iași, 29–30 iunie 1941* [Bloody Days in Iași, 29–30 June 1941] (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1978)
- Frederick Kellogg, *A History of Romanian Historical Writing* (Bakersfield, Ca.: Charles Schlacks, Jr. Publisher, 1990)
- Péter Kende, "The Trianon Syndrome: Hungarians and Their Neighbors" in Béla K. Király, ed., *Lawful Revolution in Hungary, 1989–94* (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1995), 475–492.

- Gail Kligman, *The Politics of Duplicity: Controlling Reproduction in Ceausescu's Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998)
- Gail Kligman, *Politica duplicității: Controlul nașterilor în România lui Ceaușescu* (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1999)
- Ligia Livadă-Cadeschi, *De la milă la filantropie: Instituții de asistare a săracilor din Țara Românească și Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea* [From Charity to Philanthropy: Institutions for the Assistance of the Poor in Wallachia and Moldavia in the 18th Century] (Bucharest: Editura Nemira, 2001)
- Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation-Building & Ethnic Struggle, 1918–1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995)
- Irina Livezeanu, *Cultură și naționalism în România Mare, 1918–1930* (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1998)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte. Jurnal indirect* [Short Waves: Indirect Diary] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1990)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte II. Seismograme* [Short Waves II: Seismograms] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1993)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte III. Posteritatea contemporană* [Short Waves III: The Contemporary Posterity] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1994)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte IV. Est-etice* [Short Waves IV: East-ethicals] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1994)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte V. Pragul* [Short Waves V: The Threshold] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1995)
- Monica Lovinescu, *Unde scurte VI. Insula Șerpilor* [Short Waves VI: Snake's Island] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1996)
- Monica Lovinescu, *La apa Vavilonului/ 2, 1960–1980* [To Babylon's Water/2, 1960–1980] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2001)
- Antal Lukács, *Țara Făgărașului în Evul Mediu: Secolele XIII–XIV* [The Land of Făgăraș during the Middle Ages: The 13th–14th Centuries] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1999)
- Corneliu Mihai Lungu and Mihai Retegan, eds., *1956—Explozia: Percepții române, iugoslave și sovietice asupra evenimentelor din Polonia și Ungaria* [1956—The Explosion: Romanian, Yugoslav and Soviet Perceptions of the Events of Poland and Hungary] (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 1996)
- Gheorghe Gaston Marin, *În serviciul României lui Gheorghiu-Dej: Înmănări din viață* [Serving Gheorghiu-Dej's Romania: Notes From my Life] (Bucharest: Editura Evenimentul Românesc, 2000)
- Viorel Marineasa and Daniel Vighi, eds., *Rusalii '51: Fragmente din deportarea în Bărăgan* [Whitsunday 1951: Fragments from Deportation to Bărăgan] (Timișoara: Editura Marineasa, 1994)
- Karl Marx, *Însemnări despre români: Manuscrise inedite* [Notes on the Romanians: Unedited Manuscripts] (Bucharest: Editura Academiei RPR, 1964)
- Mihai Maxim, *Țările Române și Înalta Poartă: Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în Evul Mediu* [The Romanian Principalities and the Porte: The

- Legislative Framework of the Romanian-Ottoman Relations during the Middle Ages] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993)
- Andi Mihalache, *Istorie și practici discursive în România "democrat-populară"* [History and Discursive Practices in "Popular-democratic" Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 2003)
- Șerban Milcoveanu, *Testamentul politic al lui Corneliu Z. Codreanu et al.* [The Political Will of Corneliu Z. Codreanu et al.] (n.p.: n.p.h., 1999)
- Miodrag Milin, ed., *Timișoara în arhivele "Europei Libere"*—17–20 Decembrie 1989 [Timișoara in the Archives of Radio Free Europe—17–20 December 1989] (Bucharest: Fundația Academia Civică, 1999)
- Sorin Mitu, *Geneza identității naționale la românii ardeleni* [The Genesis of National Identity of the Romanians in Transylvania] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1997)
- Sorin Mitu, *National Identity of Romanians in Transylvania* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001)
- Sorin Mitu (coord.), Lucia Copoeru, Ovidiu Pecican, Virgiliu Țărău, and Liviu Țărău, *Istorie* [History] (Bucharest: Sigma, 1999)
- Bogdan Murgescu, *Istorie românească-istorie universală, 600–1800* [Romanian History-Universal History, 600–1800] (Bucharest: Teora, 1999)
- Bogdan Murgescu, *A fi istoric în anul 2000* [Being a Historian in the Year 2000] (Bucharest: Editura All, 2000)
- Bogdan Murgescu, "The Romanian Historiography in the 1990s" in *Romanian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring 2003), pp. 30–59
- Mirela-Luminița Murgescu, *Între "bunul creștin" și "bravul român": Rolul școlii primare în construirea identității naționale românești, 1831–1878* [Between the "Good Christian" and the "Brave Romanian:" The Role of the Grammar School in the Construction of Romanian National Identity] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1999)
- Thomas Năgler, *Așezarea sașilor în Transilvania* [The Settling of the Saxons in Transylvania] (Bucharest: Editura Kriterion, 1992)
- Thomas Năgler, *Românii și sașii până la 1848* [Romanians and Saxons until 1848] (Sibiu: Editura Thausib, 1997)
- Thomas Năgler, *Transilvania și sașii ardeleni în istoriografie: Din publicațiile Asociației de Studii Transilvane Heidelberg* [Transylvania and the Transylvanian Saxons in Historiography: From the Publications of the Association for Transylvanian Studies Heidelberg] (Sibiu and Heidelberg: Editura Hora & Arbeitskreis für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde Heidelberg, 2001)
- Lucian Năstasă, *Generație și schimbare în istoriografia română: Sfârșitul secolului XIX și începutul secolului XX* [Generation and Change in Romanian Historiography: From the End of the 19th Century to the Beginning of the 20th Century] (Cluj: Cluj University Press, 1999)
- Lucian Năstasă, *Intellectualii și promovarea socială în România, sec. XIX–XX: Pentru o morfologie a câmpului universitar* [Intellectuals and Upward Mobil-

- ity in 19th and 20th Centuries: For a Morphology of the Academic Social Space] (Cluj: Limes, 2004)
- Stelian Neagoe, *Istoria guvernelor României de la începuturi–1859 până în zilele noastre–1995* [The History of the Romanian Governments from the Beginnings–1959 until Today–1995] (Bucharest: Editura Machiavelli, 1995)
- Marin Nedelea, *Istoria României în date* [Romania's History in Data, 1940–1995] (Bucharest: Editura Niculescu, 1997)
- Simona Nicoară and Toader Nicoară, *Mentalități colective și imaginar social: Istoria și noile paradigme ale cunoașterii* [Collective Mentalities and Social Imagery: History and the New Paradigms of Knowledge] (Cluj: Cluj University Press, 1996)
- Toader Nicoară, *Transilvania la începuturile timpurilor moderne, 1680–1800: Societate rurală și mentalități colective* [Transylvania at the Beginning of Modern Times, 1680–1800: Rural Society and Collective Mentalities] (Cluj: Editura Dacia, 2001)
- Paul Niculescu-Mizil, *O istorie trăită* [A Lived History] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1997)
- Paul Niculescu-Mizil, *De la Comintern la comunism național* [From Comintern to National-communism] (Bucharest: Evenimentul Românesc, 2001)
- Dimitrie Onciul, *Scrieri istorice* [Historical writings] vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1968)
- Zigu Ornea, *Anii treizeci: Extrema dreaptă românească* [The 1930s: The Romanian Extreme Right] (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1995)
- Zigu Ornea, *The Romanian Extreme Right in the Nineteen Thirties* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1999)
- Andrei Oțetea, ed., *Istoria poporului român* [The History of the Romanian People] (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1970)
- Ștefan Palaghiță, *Garda de Fier spre reînvierea României* [The Iron Guard for the Resurrection of Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Roza Vînturilor, 1993)
- P. P. Panaitescu, *Interpretări românești* [Romanian Interpretations] (Bucharest: 1947, reprint Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993)
- Petre Pandrea, *Memoriile mandarinului valah* [Memoirs of the Wallachian Mandarin] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 2000)
- Șerban Papacostea, *Românii în secolul al XIII-lea: Între cruciată și imperiul mongol* [The Romanians in the 13th Century: Between Crusade and the Mongolian Empire] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993)
- Șerban Papacostea, *Geneza statului în Evul Mediu românesc: Studii critice* [The Genesis of the State in the Romanian Middle Ages: Critical Studies] (Bucharest: Editura Corint, 1999)
- Șerban Papacostea, “O carte de istorie și istoria ei” [A History Book and Its History] in *Revista* 22, No.28 (9–15 July 2002), p. 9.
- Dumitru Pascu, *Operație fără anestezie: Din amintirile și speranțele unui chirurg* [Operation without Anesthesia: Of a Surgeon's Reminiscences and Hopes] (Bucharest: Editura Compania, 2000)

- Ștefan Pascu, "Momente din lupta poporului român pentru formarea statului național unitar" [Moments from the Romanian People's Struggle for the Formation of a Unitary Nation State] in *Magazin Istoric* 2 (February 1976), pp. 7–9.
- Ștefan Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei* [The Voievodat of Transylvania] (Bucharest: Academiei, 1977)
- Ovidiu Pecican, *Troia, Veneția, Roma* [Troy, Venice, Rome] (Cluj: EFES, 1998)
- Ovidiu Pecican, *Arpadieni, angevini, români* [Arpadians, Angevins, Romanians] (Cluj: Editura Fundației Desire, 2001)
- Ovidiu Pecican, *Originile istorice ale regionalismului românesc* [The Historical Origins of Romanian Regionalism] (Cluj: Etnograf, 2003)
- Mihai Pelin, ed., *Operațiunile "Melița" și "Eterul": Istoria Europei Libere prin documente de Securitate* [The "Melița" and "Eterul" Operations: Radio Free Europe's History through Documents of the Securitate] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1999)
- Mihai Pelin, *Opisul emigrației politice: Destine în 1222 de fișe alcătuite pe baza dosarelor din arhivele Securității* [A Directory of Political Emigration: Destinies in 1222 Resumés from the Files of the Securitate] (Bucharest: Editura Compania, 2002)
- Dan Petrescu and Liviu Cangeopol, *Ce-ar mai fi de spus: Convorbiri libere într-o țară ocupată* [What Remains to be Said: Free Conversations in an Occupied Country] (Bucharest: Minerva, 1990; new and revised edition Bucharest: Nemira, 2000)
- Alexandru-Florin Platon, *Geneza burgheziei în principatele române: A doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea-Prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea – Preliminariile unei* [The Origins of the Bourgeoisie in the Romanian Principalities in the Second Half of the 18th Century and the First Half of the 19th Century: Preliminaries to a History] (Iași: Iași University Press, 1997)
- Adrian Pop, *O fenomenologie a gândirii istorice românești: Teoria și filozofia istoriei de la Hasdeu și Xenopol la Iorga și Blaga* [A Phenomenology of Romanian Historical Thought from Hasdeu and Xenopol to Iorga and Blaga] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1997)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Instituții medievale românești: Adunările cneziale și nobiliare (boierești) din Transilvania în secolele XIV–XVI* [Romanian Medieval Institutions: Cnezial and Nobility (Boyar) Assemblies from Transylvania in the 14th–16th Centuries] (Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1991)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *The Ethno-Confessional Structure of Medieval Hungary and Transylvania* (Cluj: Cluj University Press, 1995)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Romanians and Hungarians from the 9th to the 14th century: The Genesis of the Transylvanian Medieval State* (Cluj: Fundația Culturală Română, 1996)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Istoria Transilvaniei medievale: De la etnogeneza românilor pînă la Mihai Viteazul* [The History of Transylvania: From the Romanians' Ethnogenesis to Michael the Brave] (Cluj: Cluj University Press, 1997)

- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Geneza medievală a națiunilor moderne: Secolele XIII–XVI* [The Medieval Genesis of Modern Nations: The 13th–16th Centuries] (Bucharest: Editura Fundatiei Culturale Romane, 1998)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Națiunea română medievală: Solidarități etnice românești în secolele XIII–XVI* [The Romanian Medieval Nation: Romanian Ethnic Solidarities in the 13th–16th Centuries] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998)
- Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Istoria, adevărul și miturile* [History, Truth and Myths] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002)
- Ioan Popa, *Robi pe Uranus* [Slaves on Uranus] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1992)
- Radu Popa, *Țara Maramureșului în veacul al XIV-lea* [The Land of Maramureș in the 14th Century] (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1970)
- Radu Popa, *La începuturile evului mediu românesc: Țara Hațegului* [At the Beginnings of the Romanian Middle Ages: The Land of Hațeg] (Bucharest: Editura Sport-Turism, 1988)
- Dumitru Popescu, *Un fost lider comunist se destăinuie: “Am fost și cioplitor de himere”* [A Former Communist Leader Confesses: “I Was Also a Carver of Chimeras”] (Bucharest: Editura Expres, n.d.)
- Dumitru Popescu, *Elefanții de porțelan: Scene și personaje în umbra Cortinei de Fier – Memorii transfigurate* [The China Elephants: Scenes and Characters in Iron Curtain’s Shadow – Transfigured Memoirs] (Bucharest: MATCH Bucharest, n.d.)
- Cristian Preda, *Modernitatea politică și românismul* [Political Modernity and Romanianness] (Bucharest: Nemira, 1998)
- Cristian Preda, “Acuz!” [I Accuse!] in *Revista* 22, 20–26 October 1999
- Cristian Preda, *Staulușisirena* [The Stable and the Siren] (Bucharest: Nemira, 2002)
- Dumitru Preda and Mihai Retegan, eds., *1989-Principiul dominoului: Prăbușirea regimurilor comuniste europene* [1989-The Domino Principle: The Breakdown of European Communist Regimes] (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 2000)
- David Prodan, *Memorii* [Memoirs] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993)
- Programul Partidului Comunist Român de făurire a societății socialiste multilateral dezvoltate și înaintare a României spre comunism* [The Romanian Communist Party’s Program for Establishing a Multilaterally Developed Socialist Society and Romania’s Advancement towards Communism] (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1975)
- Grigore Răduică, *Crime în lupta pentru putere, 1966–1968: Ancheta cazului Pătrășcanu* [Crimes During the Power Struggle, 1966–1968: The Inquiry on the Pătrășcanu] (Bucharest: Editura Evenimentul Românesc, 1999)
- Mihai Sorin Rădulescu, *Elita liberală românească, 1866–1900* [The Romanian Liberal Elite, 1866–1900] (Bucharest: Editura All, 1998)
- Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner, Daniela Bușe and Beatrice Marinescu (eds.), *Instaurarea totalitarismului comunist în România* [The Establishment of Communist Totalitarianism in Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Cavallioti, 1995)

- Mihail Roller, *Probleme de istorie: Contribuții la lupta pentru o istorie științifică în R.P.R.* [Historical Questions: Contributions to the Struggle for a Scientific History in the People's Republic of Romania] (Bucharest: Editura P.M.R., 1951)
- Constantin Sănătescu, *Ţurnal* [Diary] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1993)
- Ioan Scurtu, *Monarhia în România* [Monarchy in Romania] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1992)
- Ioan Scurtu, *Istoria Partidului Național Țărănesc* [A History of the National Peasant Party] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1994)
- Ioan Scurtu, ed., *1945—România: Viața politică în documente* [1945—Romania: Political Life in Documents] (Bucharest: Arhivele Statului din România, 1994)
- Ioan Scurtu, *1947—România: Viața politică în documente* [1947—Romania: Political Life in Documents] (Bucharest: Arhivele Statului din România, 1994)
- Ioan Scurtu, *Iuliu Maniu: Activitatea politică* [Iuliu Maniu: His Political Activity] (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1995)
- Ioan Scurtu, *1946—România: Viața politică în documente* [1946—Romania: Political Life in Documents] (Bucharest: Arhivele Statului din România, 1996)
- Ioan Scurtu, *Ion Brătianu* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1996)
- Ioan Scurtu, *Viața cotidiană a românilor în perioada interbelică* [The Romanians' Daily Life in the Inter-war Period] (Bucharest: Editura Rao, 2001)
- Ioan Scurtu and Ion Bulei, *Democrația la români, 1866–1938* [Romanian Democracy, 1866–1938] (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1990)
- Ioan Scurtu, Marian Curculescu, Constantin Dincă, and Aurel Constantin Soare, *Istoria Românilor* [History of the Romanians] (Bucharest: Petrion, 2000)
- Serviciul Român de Informații [Romanian Intelligence Service], *Cartea Albă a Securității: Istorii literare și artistice, 1969–1989* [The White Book of the Securitate: Literary and Artistic Stories, 1969–1989] (Bucharest: Presa Românească, 1996)
- Serviciul Român de Informații [Romanian Intelligence Service], *Cartea Albă Securității*, [The White Book of the Securitate] Vols. I–II (1994) and III–V (1995) (Bucharest, 1995)
- Paul Sfetcu, *13 ani în anticamera lui Dej* [13 Years in Dej's Antechamber] (Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 2000)
- Michael Shafir, *Între negare și trivializare prin comparație: Negarea Holocaustului în țările postcomuniste din Europa Centrală și de Est* [Between Negation and Trivialization by Comparison: The Negation of the Holocaust in the Post-Communist Countries of East-Central Europe] (Iași: Polirom, 2002)
- Aurică Simion, *Preliminarii politico-diplomatice ale insurecției române din august 1944* [Political-Diplomatic Preliminaries of the Romanian Insurrection of August 1944] (Cluj: Dacia, 1979)

- Flavius Solomon and Alexandru Zub, eds., *Basarabia: Dilemele identității* [Bessarabia: Dilemmas of Identity] (Iași: Fundația Academică A. D. Xenopol, 2001)
- Apostol Stan, *Putere politică și democrație în România, 1859–1918* [Political Power and Democracy in Romania, 1859–1918] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1995)
- Apostol Stan, *Revoluția de la 1848: Boieri și țărani* [The Revolution of 1848: Boyars and Peasants] (Bucharest: Editura Saeculum, 1996)
- Apostol Stan, *Ion Mihalache: Destinul unei vieți* [Ion Mihalache: A Life's Destiny] (Bucharest: Editura Saeculum, 1998)
- Apostol Stan, *Protectoratul Rusiei asupra Principatelor Române, 1774–1856: Între dominație absolută și anexiune* [The Russian Protectorate upon the Romanian Principalities, 1774–1856: Between Absolute Influence and Annexation] (Bucharest: Editura Saeculum, 1999)
- Nicolae Stroeșcu-Stînișoară, *În zodia exilului: Fragmente de jurnal* [Under the Sign of Exile: Pieces of a Diary] (Bucharest: Editura "Jurnalul Literar," 1994)
- Pamfil Șeicaru, *Istoria partidelor Național, Țărănist și Național-Țărănist* [A History of the National, Peasant, and National-Peasant Parties] (Bucharest: Editura Victor Frunză, 2000)
- Tia Șerbănescu, *Femeia din fotografie: Jurnal, 1987–1989* [The Woman in the Picture: Diary, 1987–1989] (Bucharest: Editura Compania, 2002)
- Florin Șperlea, *De la armata regală la armata populară: Sovietizarea armatei române, 1948–1955* [From the Royal Army to the People's Army: The Sovietization of the Romanian Army, 1948–1955] (Bucharest: Editura Ziua, 2003)
- Ștefan Ștefănescu, ed., *Enciclopedia istoriografiei românești* [Encyclopedia of Romanian Historiography] (Bucharest: Editura științifică și enciclopedică, 1978)
- Stelian Tănase, *Ora oficială de iarnă: Jurnal* [The Official Wintertime: A Diary] (Iași: Institutul European, 1995)
- Stelian Tănase, *Elite și societate: Guvernarea Gheorghiu-Dej, 1948–1965* [Elites and Society: The Gheorghiu-Dej Regime, 1948–1965] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1998)
- Stelian Tănase, *Acasă se vorbește în șoaptă* [At Home, One Whispers] (Bucharest: Editura Compania, 2002)
- Alexandru Tatos, *Pagini de jurnal* [Pages of a Diary] (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1994)
- Vladimir Tismăneanu, "The Tragicomedy of Romanian Communism," in Ferenc Feher and Andrew Arato, eds., *Crisis and Reform in Eastern Europe* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1991), pp. 121–74.
- Vladimir Tismăneanu, "From Arrogance to Irrelevance: Avatars of Marxism in Romania," in Raymond Taras, ed., *The Road to Disillusion: From Critical Marxism to Postcommunism in Eastern Europe* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1992), pp. 135–50.

- Vladimir Tismăneanu, *Arheologia terorii* [The Archeology of Terror] (Bucharest: Editura Eminescu, 1992, new. and rev. ed. Editura All 1998)
- Vladimir Tismăneanu, *Fantoma lui Gheorghiu-Dej* [The Phantom of Gheorghiu-Dej] (Bucharest: Editura Univers, 1995)
- Vladimir Tismăneanu, *Noaptea totalitară* [The Totalitarian Night] (Bucharest: Editura Athena, 1995)
- Vladimir Tismăneanu, *Stalinism for All Seasons: A Political History of Romanian Communism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003)
- Balázs Trencsényi et al., *Nation-Building and Contested Identities: Romanian & Hungarian Case Studies* (Budapest and Iași: Regio Books & Polirom, 2001)
- Dorin Tudoran, *Kakistocrația* [Kakistocracy] (Chișinău: Arc, 1998)
- Pavel Țugui, *Istoria și limba română în vremea lui Gheorghiu-Dej: Memoriile unui fost șef de Secție a C.C. al P.M.R* [History and Romanian Language in Gheorghiu-Dej's Times: Memoirs of a Former Chief of Section of the Romanian Workers Party] (Bucharest: Editura Ion Cristoiu, 1999)
- Cristian Vasile, *Între Vatican și Kremlin: Biserica Greco-Catolică în timpul regimului comunist* [Between the Vatican and the Kremlin: The Greek-Catholic Church under the Communist Regime] (Bucharest: Editura Curtea Veche, 2003)
- Francisco Veiga, *La mística del ultranacionalismo: Historia de la Guardia del Hierro. Rumania, 1919–1941* (Ballaterra: Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1989)
- Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991)
- Katherine Verdery, *Compromis și rezistență: Cultura română sub Ceaușescu* (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1994)
- Laurențiu Vlad, *Imagini ale identității naționale: România și expozițiile universale de la Paris, 1867–1937* [Images of National Identity: Romania and the World Exhibitions in Paris, 1867–1937] (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 2001)
- Laurențiu Vlad, *Pe urmele "Belgiei Orientului": România la expozițiile universale sau internaționale de la Anvers, Bruxelles, Liège și Gand, 1894–1935* [Following the "Belgium of the Orient": Romania at the World Exhibitions in Antwerp, Brussels, Liège, and Gent, 1894–1935] (Bucharest: Nemira, 2004)
- Laurențiu Vlad, *Ecouri românești în presa franceză: L'Illustration, 1843–1944* [Reflections of Romania in the French media: L'Illustration, 1843–1944] (Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 2004)
- Smaranda Vultur, *Istorie trăită—istorie povestită: Deportarea în Bărăgan, 1951–1956* [Lived History—Narrated History: Deportation to Bărăgan, 1951–1956] (Timișoara: Editura Amarcord, 1997)
- Smaranda Vultur, "New Topics, New Tendencies and New Generations of Historians in Romanian Historiography" in Ulf Brunnbauer, ed., *(Re)Writing History: Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), pp. 236–27.

- Smaranda Vultur, ed., *Germanii din Banat prin povestirile lor* [The Germans in the Banat through Their Accounts] (Bucharest: Editura Paideia, 2000)
- A. D. Xenopol, *Teoria lui Rösler: Studii asupra stăruinței românilor în Dacia Traiană* [Rösler's Theory: Studies on the Romanians' Continuity in Dacia Traiana] (Iași, 1884, reprint Bucharest: Albatros, 1998)
- Herbert (Belu) Zilber, *Actor în procesul Pătrășcanu: Prima versiune a memoriilor lui Belu Zilber* [Actor in the Pătrășcanu Trial: The First Version of Belu Zilber's Memoirs] (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1997)
- Alexandru Zub, ed., *Culture and Society: Structures, Interferences, Analogies in Modern Romanian History* (Iași: Editura Academiei RSR, 1985)
- Alexandru Zub, *La Révolution Française et les Roumains: Impact, Images, Interpretations* (Iași: Ed. Universitatea "Al.I. Cuza", 1989)
- Alexandru Zub, *Istorie și finalitate* [History and Fulfillment] (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1991)
- Alexandru Zub, *În orizontul istoriei* [On the Horizon of History] (Iași: Institutul European, 1994)
- Alexandru Zub, *La sfârșit de ciclu* [At the End of a Cycle] (Iași: Institutul European, 1994)
- Alexandru Zub, *Impactul reîntregirii* [The Deadlock of Reunification] (Iași: Editura Timpul, 1995)
- Alexandru Zub, *Discurs istoric și tranziție: În căutarea unei paradigme* [Historical Discourse and Transition: In Search of a Paradigm] (Iași: Institutul European, 1998)
- Alexandru Zub, *Orizont închis: Istoriografia română sub dictatură* [Closed Horizon: Romanian Historiography under the Dictatorship] (Iași: Institutul European, 2000)

Ivan Elenkov and Daniela Koleva

Historical Studies in Post-Communist Bulgaria: Between Academic Standards and Political Agendas¹

History as a research field and an academic discipline was constituted in Bulgaria—as in many other countries—in the context of a broad national agenda. Consequently, its ideological and political functions were inseparable from its development as a field of study. Starting with what has been considered the first book on Bulgarian history (*Istoria slavianobolgarskaya*, written in the mid-18th century), Bulgarian history writing has focused almost exclusively on Bulgaria alone, has served in intellectual and ‘scientific’ arguments for national causes in different contexts, and has been mobilized for the legitimization of various political claims. History found the role of *magistra vitae* in the construction of the national ‘grand narrative’ and the fostering of national identity in the first place. In general, communist historiography diverged from this national agenda less than it might seem. True, in the first two decades after 1944, the ‘grand narrative’ of history was ideologically straightened and brought in line with the main principles of historical materialism. But from the 1960s on, Bulgarian ethnicity, the Bulgarian nation, and other aspects of ‘Bulgarian-ness’ began to gradually reappear in historiography (if they had ever disappeared), reviving a national focus and a nationalist bias. The reason was not only the search for ‘safer’ topics—i.e. ones not directly related to the ideology of class struggle and the political agenda of the ruling Communist Party—but also an attempt to emancipate historiography from Communist ideology and politics by re-introducing national narrative instead of class narrative. However, the precondition of this was again to be found in ideology—in the post-Stalinist postulate that class struggle in Socialist countries was over and a new unity was being established. The notion of the Nation was suitable to represent that unity. A series of commemorative occasions served to promote the cause: the centennials of national hero Vasil

Levski's death in 1873, of the 1876 uprising against the Ottoman domination, of the Russian–Turkish war in 1877–78, which led to establishing an independent Bulgarian state, and—most notably—the 1300th anniversary of the establishment of the first Bulgarian state in 681.

The oldest and most authoritative Bulgarian journal in the field, *Istoricheski pregled*, offers a glimpse of the main research priorities. In a paper dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the journal, the main thematic fields were ranked according to the number of related articles published during the whole period of the journal's existence: 1) the period from 1878 to 1945; 2) the period of the 'National Revival,' i.e. the formation of the nation; 3) the medieval period; 4) antiquity.²

1. POLITICAL CONTEXTS, INSTITUTIONS AND PROJECTS: 1944–1989

In her paper on Bulgarian historiography, Maria Todorova asserts that

Bulgarian historiography remained outside the main trends of the historical profession and did not even try to confront the great debates, or even to get informed about them, a situation attributable more to the quality of people who entered the discipline and to the traditions that it has followed closely from its inception than exclusively to external circumstances...

Further, she claims that “[a]ll this is not to say that the historical profession lacked erudite scholars who were cultivated linguists and intellectuals of integrity. But it lacked the critical mass of such individuals necessary to influence the entire discipline.”³ Though the “critical mass” and the “quality of people” are certainly important, what we would like to bring to the fore here is the institutional context, which is, in our opinion, crucial, insofar as it establishes the professional canon, sets the standards as to what historiography is and how it is carried out, and ensures the continuity of the paradigm.

Until 1944, research and education in history were centered around the degree course in history offered by the University of Sofia. The establishment of Communist rule in Bulgaria imposed radical changes in the system and the structure of the production of knowledge of the past. As a result of the steadily increasing admission of regular students after the war, by the late 1940s the Faculty of History

and Philology of the University had become a “hothouse of teacher cadres.”⁴ In 1951, the degree course in history was separated from the ‘philologies.’ A new Faculty of Philosophy and History—with degree courses in philosophy, history, and pedagogy—was established. Thus, history was dissociated from the ‘classical’ academic subjects and institutionally affiliated with Marxist-Leninist ideology. Between 1970 and 1972, three projects on the structure of an autonomous Faculty of History were elaborated and considered. With a regulation issued in April 1972, the Council of Ministers awarded an autonomous status to historians at the University of Sofia.

In line with the Soviet attempt to separate research from university teaching, the leading role in research was transferred from the University of Sofia to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS).⁵ On the strength of a new law regarding the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, adopted on 11 February 1947, an Institute of Bulgarian History was established at the Academy’s Branch of History and Philology by a BAS Executive Council resolution dated 6 March 1947.⁶ Following the resolutions of the 10th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) and the program for “building a developed Socialist society” in Bulgaria, the October 1971 plenum of the BCP’s Central Committee (CC) launched an initiative on broad integration of research and training of personnel with higher education.⁷ According to the plenum resolutions, in April 1972 the Council of Ministers issued an express regulation on the restructuring of the Academy of Sciences and the University of Sofia. The existing academic structures were integrated into super-organizations embracing BAS research institutes, laboratories employed in similar areas, and the corresponding faculties and degree courses at the University of Sofia. Nine integrated centers of science and training of personnel with higher education were established under the jurisdiction of the Academy.

The Integrated Center of Science and Personnel Training in History incorporated the five academic research institutes concerned mainly with the past—the Institute of History, the Institute of Balkan Studies, the Institute and Museum of Archaeology, the Institute and Museum of Ethnography, and the Institute of Thracian Studies—as well as the newly established Faculty of History at the University of Sofia.

The Council of Ministers’ regulation also reorganized the internal structure of the institutions producing historical knowledge within the

jurisdiction of the Center. Precisely this regulation gave Bulgaria's institutions for historical research the form which they would keep, more or less unchanged, right until the end of the 20th century. The break-up of the Integrated Center in 1990 and its official closure in 1992⁸ did not lead in practice to any changes in the institutions hitherto integrated into this super-bureaucratic structure.

The fifth Congress of the BCP in 1948 assigned "the historical front" the important task of writing a history that would elucidate "scientifically" Bulgaria's past and outline the prospects for Bulgaria's development. This task was assigned to the Institute for Bulgarian History. In December 1949 the Propaganda Department of the CC of the BCP submitted a structure of the future history and a proposal on the team of authors to the Politburo for approval.⁹ As work on the history proceeded, the original full-time staff was extended considerably, the Institute's organizational structure was also changed and extended, and Dimitar Kossev was appointed director of the Institute.

The two volumes of the first comprehensive Marxist-Leninist history of Bulgaria were published in 1954 and 1955. Long conceived and revised, initially published in the form of a "trial copy" for "official use only" and preceded by consultations with Soviet historians and loud public propaganda debates, this book proved to be very short-lived. Radical revision in the course of the denunciation of Stalin's personality cult started almost immediately after its publication. This process also had a direct bearing on the Institute itself, which underwent a number of changes—in the late 1950s its scope of research was extended, the number of its departments increased, as well as the number of its staff. In 1962 Hristo Hristov was appointed director of the Institute, a position which he held right until 1989. In the early 1960s the revised history of Bulgaria was published in a longer version in three volumes (volume 1, 1961; volume 2, 1962; and volume 3, 1964).

In 1965 the Institute's administration renewed the initiative of writing of a new scientific multi-volume history of Bulgaria.¹⁰ The original project envisaged 10, and the final one 14, volumes. By 1966 the writing of the "Big History" was identified as a task set by the 9th congress of the BCP.¹¹ A special meeting of the Politburo, designed to set the concrete conceptual guidelines and to ensure the appropriate material conditions, was held on 21 May 1968 and adopted an express resolution in two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part

set the deadline for the completion of the text—1978, as part of the celebrations of the centenary of Bulgaria's Liberation, as well as "the theoretical and scientific basis on which the history should be created": "The ten-volume history of Bulgaria should be written from the perspective of and consistent with the positions of the Marxist-Leninist methodology, on the basis of all scientific studies to date and considerable new source and documentary material."¹² In the practical part of the resolution, the Politburo named the BAS Institute of History the "organizational and leading center of all Bulgarian historians," and noted extensive measures facilitating access to archives, providing additional funds in the BAS budget in the 1968–1972 period, collecting data from archives abroad and, most importantly, opening additional full-time positions for academic and other personnel.¹³

The preparatory four-year stage of the work on the multi-volume history presupposed "mobilization" of the entire "historical front," i.e., the transformation and enlargement of the existing structures for producing historical knowledge in Bulgaria. There was a direct connection between the establishment of the Integrated Center and the multi-volume history. The Integrated Center's first Integrated Research Plan for 1972–1975 identified preparations for the publication of the History as the priority task.¹⁴

Assessing progress in the first four-year preparatory stage following the Politburo's 1968 resolution, on 12 July 1972 the Secretariat of the CC of the BCP likewise adopted an express resolution that provided concrete support for the writing of the multi-volume history.¹⁵ The Secretariat's 1972 resolution provided for the elaboration of concrete curricula training specialists in little researched areas of Bulgarian history. The establishment of an autonomous Faculty of History at the University of Sofia can be explained in this context. The Faculty began the 1972/73 academic year with a tangibly increased teaching staff and admission of students. In the 1970s the number of Faculty lecturers and students doubled, reaching levels which remained more or less unchanged until the end of Communism.¹⁶ From 102 people in 1989, following the closure of the Department of BCP History, the teaching staff approximated 80 persons in 2002, according to data from the Dean's Office.

In 1972 the team of authors and editors of the "Big History" reached 126 persons. They included 82 historians, 11 archaeologists,

four ethnographers, five philosophers, four pedagogues, three literary critics, two linguists, economists, chemists, geologists, geographers, medics and architects each, and one art critic, journalist, and biologist each. Ultimately, 26 research institutes and units, eight of which were not in the Integrated Center, were recruited to write the “Big History”.¹⁷

The chief academic supervisor of the project was the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the History Dimitar Kossev, and the main practical supervisor—the Director of the Integrated Center—Nikolai Todorov. The original design of the Big History would be revised repeatedly in the next decades. Although it turned into a re-elicit initiative after the collapse of Communism, the publication of the “Big History” did not discontinue. The administration of the BAS Institute of History has continued to regard it as a main research task right out to the present day. At present, the Institute is working on volumes 9 and 10.

In addition to the firmly established institutional organization of the production of historical knowledge, a number of situations which, *prima facie*, are totally unrelated to that organization also must be described and analyzed. These are situations that emerged in a particular—mainly political—context, but had a long-term effect both on the formalized structures for acquiring knowledge about the past and on the science of history in the period of socialism as a whole. In brief, they may be defined as follows: 1) national conferences of historians in Bulgaria; 2) public debates and discussions, especially on the “collective method of work” in particular; 3) the campaign against old academic authorities revealing the impossibility of establishing a Marxist historiographical canon; 4) the “new discourse” on Bulgarian history from the early 1960s; 5) commemorations and academic forums; 6) the disbanding and re-establishment of the Bulgarian Historical Society. Only some of these will be examined here.¹⁸

The first national conference of historians was held in March and April 1948. In his opening speech Vulko Chervenkov, then member of the Politburo of the CC of the BCP, said that the convening of historians had been necessitated by the need to review the science of history and purge it of the dominant bourgeois concepts. The keynote report at the conference, entitled “The State and the Tasks of Bulgarian Science of History,” was entrusted to Tóushé Vlahov, then assistant professor at the University of Sofia. Vlahov began his academic career

after World War II comparatively late in life, at the age of 46; before that he was a high-school teacher of Communist persuasion. The report was based on the presumption that the legacy left by academic predecessors was not a sound basis for the development of the science of history, because even "...at best they reflect within themselves the ideology of the former ruling classes."¹⁹ Therefore the report formulated the tasks of the science of history in Bulgaria as follows:

1. To make a complete break with the anti-scientific method of philological formalism and idealistic concepts of historical development.
2. To liquidate all fascist-chauvinistic influences that could still be found in historical literature and that linger in the minds of historians.
3. To denounce all distortions, fabrications, and anti-scientific theses of bourgeois historians.
4. To build historical research on the basis of historical materialism, the only scientific method.
5. To organize the study of a series of problems ignored by bourgeois historians, mainly in the field of social and economic relations.
6. To research in detail the relations between the Slavic peoples in the past, especially the USSR and Yugoslavia, with an emphasis on the moments that have facilitated and will facilitate their growing closeness.
7. To study Bulgaria's history in the context of the general historical development.²⁰

The second national conference (13-14 January 1964) is of crucial importance for understanding the processes that shaped the institutions, the professional community, and the research paradigms of Bulgarian history, which have in many respects remained valid to this very day. That is why we must note several things about the context of the time.

The "wind of change" brought about by the April 1956 plenum of the CC of the BCP reached historians late. Things changed significantly only after the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in 1961 and, as regards the historical community, especially after the December 1962 All-Union Conference of Historians in the USSR. On 31 January and 7 February 1963—and, notably, at the initiative of the theoretical workshops at the Institute for History

and the University of Sofia's Faculty of Philosophy and History—joint extended meetings were held on the subject of "The Damage from the Personality Cult in Bulgarian Science of History and the Task of Surmounting It."²¹ The discussions at those meetings demonstrate the conflict between the institutional projects for the rewriting of Bulgarian history as false knowledge about the past²² and the claims to "historical truth" as expert, apolitical, and anti-ideological knowledge. The ideologized narrative was called into doubt, and the discussions demonstrate the "new discourse" on history, which was not unified and was revealed in several approaches to the past.

In content, the subsequent Second National Conference of Historians hardly differed from the 1963 discussion. The significant difference was that the conference was convened by a resolution of the CC of BCP and for all practical purposes formalized the spontaneity of the theoretical workshops. Dimitar Kossev's report "On the State and Tasks of the Bulgarian Science of History" was ambiguous. Using by then clichéd anti-personality-cult rhetoric, Kossev abandoned the claim to "historical truth" as expert knowledge—a claim which he seems to have supported a year earlier.²³

But, after all, the times had changed and the debates that followed the report reveal an entirely different atmosphere in comparison to that of 1948. After a series of statements that had obviously been prepared in advance, the floor was taken by Goran Todorov, then senior research fellow at the Institute for History at BAS. His statement turned the tide at the national conference. Todorov started by flawlessly identifying the implications in Kossev's report which referred to the 1948 conference, and went on to declare openly: "Any attempts at identifying the tasks of this conference with the tasks of the 1948 conference will seriously impair our science of history."²⁴ His statement registered two important terms that seem to have already initiated an internal professional anti-ideological critical discourse: "national psychology"²⁵ and the sharper "national nihilism."²⁶

One of the important parts of the keynote report was devoted to the "Improvement of the Organization of Scientific Work and Personnel Training in History." D. Kossev announced that of almost 300 historians with expert professional status (including historians, archaeologists, ethnographers, archivists, etc.), 161 had exclusively devoted themselves to the history of the BCP. He offered the following break-

down: the number of scholars working on the history of Bulgaria totaled 47, of whom ten were medievalists, three historians of the Bulgarian National Revival, twelve historians of the period from 1878 to 1917, five of the period from 1917 to 1944, three scholars of socialist construction, six economic historians, and eight military historians of Bulgaria. The specialists in general history totaled 30, of them three worked on ancient history, two on medieval history, two on history of Byzantium, seven on modern history, eight on contemporary history, three on history of Russia and the USSR, and five on Balkan history. Neither the report nor the statements commented on the obvious disproportion between Communist Party historians and all others. Much attention, however, was paid to the circumstance that many young historians, especially in the field of Communist Party history, were defending dissertations or working on identical or very close themes. The conclusion was that "the scientific organization and guidance of the historical front" was not good and that it was necessary to take measures regarding coordinating the work of Bulgarian historians and cooperation between them. In 1968 a resolution of the Secretariat of the CC of BCP approved the constitution of a standing "Coordinating Council on History of the BCP."²⁷

The report formulated the strategic directions for the development of the science of history in the coming years, including research on the problems of contemporary Bulgarian history and the history of the working-class movement and the BCP; the history of Bulgarian culture from ancient times to the present; the problems of the national liberation movement; Balkan history, with an accent on contemporary times; the writing of a multi-volume scientific history of Bulgaria and a multi-volume scientific history of the BCP; the fight against the distortions of Bulgarian history and popularization of historical knowledge.

The Third National Conference was held on 18 June 1975. The keynote report was entitled—predictably—"The State and the Tasks of Bulgarian Science of History" and, according to the established tradition of authoritarian proclamations of the truth, was delivered by the highest-ranking official in the hierarchy of historical studies, Professor Nikolai Todorov, Director of the Integrated Center of Science and Personnel Training in History. The report actually shows a new situation in the field of historical studies. The first thing that catches the eye in N. Todorov's report is the absence of devices designed

to establish control over the professional community. In 1975 such control was obviously taken for granted. Moreover, albeit indirectly, Todorov called into doubt the justification of the national conference and similar initiatives, declaring that "mass discussions justified by the need of raising the scientific level of output and ensuring a collective method" ought to be abandoned and "the discussions of manuscripts and works ought to be conducted strictly and within the circle of the competent persons only."²⁸ Indeed, the third national conference of historians was the last of its kind. The end of the national conferences proves the real professionalization of the historical community within the limits possible during socialism, the established stability of the community's internal structure, its steady growth rates, its guaranteed reproduction and, last but not least, the effectiveness of the mechanisms of its supervision and control.

The data on the historical community presented in 1975 are organized on a different principle and are less revealing, but they are certainly not incomparable with the data from 1964. The first thing that meets the eye is the drastic growth in the share of scholars dealing with archaeology, ancient, and medieval history: the professionals working in this field had reached 27.8% of the total staff and 20.2% of the historians with academic degrees.²⁹ In the late 1960s and early 1970s national archaeological programs for research, conservation, and restoration of the old Bulgarian capitals of Pliska, Preslav and Veliko Tarnovo had been launched by different government resolutions. This period also saw the establishment of the Institute for Thracian Studies.

For some unknown reason, N. Todorov classified researchers in Bulgarian history from the 15th to the 20th century in a single group. They thus made up 40.7% of the total number of all historians and 42.5% of the historians with academic degrees. Within this group alone, 50% studied the Ottoman period and the National Revival, 35.3% Bulgarian capitalism, and 14.7% socialist construction. The ratio of scholars of Bulgarian history from the national liberation to the present, however, remained definitely in favor of Communist Party historians: 27.4% studied civil history and 72.6% BCP history. Todorov's data do not offer an insight into the total number of historians and the share of Communist Party historians among them, nor into the post-1964 changes in the group of the latter, which obviously decreased somewhat in the general context of the steady growth of the historical community.

Todorov classified in another group scholars of modern and contemporary history, history of the USSR, the international working-class and Communist movement, and Balkan studies. They were 18.6% of the total staff and 27.2% of the historians with academic degrees. Within this group the majority were experts in Balkan studies (43.2%), followed by scholars of the international Communist and working-class movement and the CPSU (33.4%), and, finally, researchers of modern and contemporary general history and the history of the USSR (23.4%) The smallest group was that of the ethnographers, who accounted for 7.5% of the total number of historians and 6.4% of historians with academic degrees.³⁰

The public debates and discussions had a normative function: starting from the end of the 1940s, they were at first an obvious political instrument of reformulating the research paradigms; by the end of the 1970s they were gradually normalized and started fulfilling their natural purpose as a form of professional exchange. Thus the first Marxist-Leninist history of Bulgaria produced by “the collective method of work,” published in two volumes (1954 and 1955), was subjected to two open (and numerous other) discussions. The first discussion of the “dummy” (model) of volume 1 took place in the Institute of Slavic Studies at the Soviet Academy of Sciences in Moscow on 22 October 1953.³¹ Afterwards, the same “dummy” of volume 1 was discussed in Sofia at six meetings from 13 to 23 November 1953.³² In early 1955, at the request of the Director of the Institute of History D. Kossev, the Institute of Slavic Studies at the Soviet Academy of Sciences organized a discussion of the “dummy” of volume 2 of the *History*, which took place from 18 to 20 March with the participation of a Bulgarian delegation of top-ranking historians.³³ Two months later, from 17 to 26 May 1955, the “dummy” of volume 2 of the *History* was discussed in public in Sofia too.³⁴ The facts noted above suggest the essence of the so-called “collective method of work,” which was the subject of the liveliest debate for decades: the “collective” or team here was not formed *horizontally* by historians themselves, but *vertically*, between historians and *power*.

It is impressive that the discussion themes set in the period of initial efforts to reform the science of history in line with Marxism remained almost unchanged throughout the period of socialism. In fact, the majority of them have not changed to this very day. Historians would argue,

reject or assert, but they would seldom overstep the admissible limits of discussion of the Bulgarian past. We find those themes in the 1950 and 1951 plans of the Institute of History: 1) The periodization of Bulgarian history; 2) Classes and class relations in the National Revival period; 3) The ideology of the Bulgarian national revolutionaries; 4) Main stages in the development of capitalism in Bulgaria; 5) The essence and character of fascism in Bulgaria; 6) The Macedonian question.³⁵ Arguably, the professional canon of work and the concept of scholarly standard were formed mainly within the limits of these problem areas, even though the latter itself has not been problematized to date.

In compliance with the “Decree on the Purging of the Teaching Staff of Primary and Secondary Schools, Teachers’ Institutions, the University, Institutions of Higher Learning, and Academies” (November 1944), staff guilty of connections (proven or putative) with the old regime, as well as those adhering to “reactionary” convictions—whether scientific or political—were fired and replaced by Marxist historians, in most cases affiliated with the Communist Party. Until the end of the 1960s almost all authors invariably included in the introduction to their respective studies denunciations of bourgeois historiography and references to the fledgling Marxist tradition in conceptualizing the past. A historiographical Marxist canon, however, ultimately failed to materialize. There are two reasons for this. The first reason is the absolute incomparability of the old academic authorities and those who had written on Bulgarian past from the positions of historical materialism before 1944. The second reason is that, despite the gradual growth of the historical community and the gradual assertion of the concept of scholarly standards as apolitical and anti-ideological historical knowledge, the works of the old academic authorities remained definitive. They would remain a source of arguments against the ideological projects on a complete or partial rewriting of Bulgarian history throughout the socialist period.

The units that were created precisely for the purpose of writing a history of the science of history in the spirit of continuity with the Marxist tradition themselves came under the same influences. Thus instead of reassessing the links in the conceptualization of the past, the old authors would be distributed among and assigned *en masse* to historians working on historiographical problems, and every single fact of their life and work would be registered conscientiously.

The main claim of the “new discourse” was the discovery of the truth or the so-called “historical truth.” A definite change in the regime’s policy concerning sharing and publicly articulating the truth occurred in the early 1960s. In the “new discourse” the past was all-Bulgarian. The early 1960s saw the gradual relegation of the class- and Party-based approach to the past. Although remnants of that approach would of course survive till the end of the socialist period, from the beginning of this decade Bulgarian historians would become responsible for “the entire past.”

The “new discourse” was expert, i.e., different from the ideological discourse. During the discussion of the damage from the personality cult, M. Isusov admitted that among Bulgarian historians there were different views on many questions from the history of the BCP, such as some Party decisions on the national question, the resolutions of the 1924 Vitosha conference, etc. “Obviously—he concluded—it is necessary to find a way of discussing those and certain other questions calmly and in depth in order to arrive at their correct resolution.”³⁶ Such a form was indeed found, although not very quickly. In compliance with a resolution of the Secretariat of the CC of the BCP dated 17 July 1970, the Institute of History of the BCP elaborated and submitted for approval to the Secretariat and, eventually, to the Council of Ministers, “Classified Research Papers Regulations” (*Pravilnik za zakritite naouchni troudove*). We quote here only Paragraph (2) from Section I, “General Provisions”:

2. Within the meaning of these Regulations, classified shall be the research papers and dissertations on the problems of the international Communist movement, the foreign policy and defense of the P[eople’s]R[epublic of]B[ulgaria], international socialist integration, the fight against anti-Communism and revisionism, the history of the BCP, social government and other questions, for the writing of which materials for restricted use have been employed, or which contain findings, conclusions or proposals the publication of which is not advisable...³⁷

Expert discourse on the past developed from the early 1960s in several directions. One of the earliest, most widely propagated and most loudly supported directions would be the fight against fabrications of

and encroachments on Bulgarian national history—a topic requiring separate study. The Politburo would interfere as a special co-author in this subject matter—initially in every single attempt in this direction and, eventually, less and less frequently—, but it would never distance itself completely.

In the course of the discussion of the damage caused by the personality cult to the science of history, Goran Todorov would utter the words “national nihilism.” In the denunciations of the BCP policy on the national question this term would be constituted as an important reference point in the construction of a professional anti-ideological discourse in the rapidly developing studies on the subject from the mid-1960s onwards. By a resolution of the Integrated Center of History dated 9 January 1975, this subject matter acquired an institutional form: a problem group on “National Liberation Movements during Capitalism,” headed by Professor L. Panayotov, was created within the Section on the History of Bulgaria during Capitalism. In 1980 twelve tenured staff positions were established, and the problem group acquired the status of a separate department called “National Liberation Movement after the Congress of Berlin.” In the mid-1980s the section’s staff increased to 21 members, covering all aspects of the Bulgarian national question in Macedonia, Thrace, Dobroudja, Morava, and the so-called Western Outlands (Eastern Serbia). In the first half of the 1990s the staff was reduced to 12 members and the department was renamed “Bulgarian Ethnic Territories and Communities after 1878.” Since 1998 it has been called “History of the Bulgarian National Question.”³⁸ The subject has remained extremely prestigious in the historical community to this very day.

From the first half of the 1960s a not very clear or permanently present thematic field centered around concepts such as “national stereotype” and “national psychology” emerged in the “new discourse” on the past. The claims to historical truth here go beyond empirical limits; in a sense, “the truth” is felt to be “metaphysical” but strongly critical of the present. We will try to illustrate those claims to truth by citing two papers by Nikolai Genchev that are legendary among part of the historical community. The first, from 1965 and co-authored by V. Gyuzelev, is titled “The Traitors in Bulgarian History.” The second, from 1966, is a sharply critical review of Bulgarian historical science, revealingly called “Teacher of Life, But When?” The papers were con-

sidered by the Politburo of the CC of the BCP and Todor Zhivkov himself, who assessed the works of “the young historian N. Genchev” as “abounding in nihilistic assessments of the past of the Bulgarian people” and as “an attempt to channel the efforts of Bulgarian historians in a wrong direction.”³⁹ The papers demonstrate fervent passion for “the historical truth” and carry multi-layered messages. Primarily, they make an effort to touch on the inexpressible in the recording of facts to which Bulgarian historiography is a slave. This outlines another layer of sharp critique of historiography that fabricates the Bulgarian past, and of critique, to quote Nikolai Genchev, aimed against “the entire wretched spirit of this age.”⁴⁰ The institutional embodiment of this line can be seen in the Department for History and Theory of Culture, established at the Faculty of History, University of Sofia, in the early 1980s, which evolved in the next decade into an autonomous university degree course within, however, the Faculty of Philosophy.

And here is yet another line in the “new discourse,” albeit not directly concerned with the Bulgarian past—or, more precisely, concerned with the latter but mediated through research in a broader cultural and social historical context. In the early 1960s N. Todorov elaborated a concept of Balkan studies, finalized with the establishment of an Institute of Balkan Studies at the BAS in 1964. According to this concept, Balkan studies is a complex research field studying the Balkan community in its socio-economic, political, and cultural relations and mutual influences; this is the first well-reasoned concept of interdisciplinary studies in Bulgarian historiography. However, the context within which this concept was set closely associated Balkan studies in its early period with topical issues in Bulgarian foreign policy.

The concept of Thracian studies, born in the 1960s, acquired institutional form with the creation of an eponymous institute at BAS in 1972. Alexander Fol, author of the concept and founder of the Institute, regarded Thracian studies as a higher level of Bulgarian ancient studies guided by the idea of “complex research of antiquity and of the slave system in the southern Danubian lands and their neighboring territories. This research is centered on Thracian studies as an autonomous discipline, similar in type to Etruscan studies, and will cover the history, material culture, arts, and language of the Thracian tribes.”⁴¹

From its establishment at the end of the 1960s, the Institute of History at BAS was invariably expected to submit proposals for cel-

celebrating anniversaries that were considered and approved by the Politburo of the CC of BCP. Historical knowledge had an ideological function, and the institutions producing historical knowledge were required to provide it, with anniversaries turned into occasions to use history for ideological purposes in the current political context.

The early 1960s saw the beginning of gradual concentration on the professional aspect of anniversary celebrations. The turning point in this respect came with the 200th anniversary of Paissii Hilendarski's *Istoriya Slavyanobolgarskaya* (Slav-Bulgarian History). From then onwards professional discourse during anniversary celebrations would increasingly emancipate itself from ideological discourse, culminating in the 1980s with the highly prestigious Annual Scientific Workshop of Young Historians in Primorsko organized by the Institute of History, and a few conferences organized by the Faculty of History at the University of Sofia—prominent forums for the professional proclamation of “the historical truth.”

Bulgarian participation in international forums, as well as international forums on history organized in Bulgaria, developed along similar lines. As an illustration, we will trace the interesting vicissitudes of the organization of the First Congress of Balkan Studies (26 August to 1 September 1966) in Sofia. In the organizational concept of the Congress the Secretariat of the CC of BCP set the main political and scholarly tasks that were expected to be solved: a) the Congress must confirm the practice of the BCP policy of peaceful understanding; b) it must present Bulgaria well as the host of the initiative; c) Bulgarian scholars must take the initiative in this new scientific field so that Bulgaria will become one of the major centers of world Balkan studies; d) “a dominant position of Marxist thought must be secured at the Congress and vestiges of the past and nationalist relapses must not be allowed to be used by the imperialist agents,” and e) the Congress must establish contacts as a base for further cooperation.⁴²

Long before the Congress, the organizers established personal contacts with the heads of the delegations from the socialist countries, and signed preliminary agreements with some of them. The “Agreement” signed with the Yugoslav representatives at the Congress regulated the way in which open discussions on sensitive questions were to be avoided. It was admissible to note the main theses on the disputed issues, without antagonizing the peoples of the two countries.⁴³ According to

the Director of the Institute of Balkan Studies, this Agreement "...deserves top political and scientific marks" because the Yugoslavs had honored their assumed obligations and, following N. Todorov's keynote paper on "The Bulgarian People in Its Relations with the Other Balkan Peoples," in which Todorov advanced the thesis that the 19th and early 20th century national liberation movement was part of the liberation struggle of the Bulgarian people, the leadership of the Yugoslav delegation did not allow historians from Skopje to take the floor, who were thus denied the opportunity to present their thesis of the existence of a Macedonian nation in this age.⁴⁴ Had this not been the case, according to preliminary information again, there was a potential danger that the incident would have given an excuse to the Greek delegation, which expected precisely that, to take action to disrupt the proceedings of the Congress.

A preliminary agreement was also reached between the Bulgarian side and the leadership of the Soviet delegation. As a result, some papers that conflicted with "Bulgarian national history" were stricken off the agenda during the congress on the instructions of the Soviet leadership. In addition to those preliminary agreements, the Bulgarian organizers undertook to mediate in the negotiations between historians from the Romanian and Soviet delegations. The negotiations between the Romanian and Soviet historians were preceded by preliminary talks at the highest Party and state level between Todor Zhivkov and Nicolae Ceaușescu.⁴⁵ Following those talks, the historians were able to agree that passages in Romanian historian V. Maciu's paper for the plenary session regarded as anti-Bulgarian, anti-Soviet, and potentially very likely to prompt a series of anti-Soviet statements would be edited out.

The First Congress of Balkan Studies was indeed one of the largest scientific forums organized in Bulgaria: more than 500 papers were presented and more than 1,000 statements were made during the proceedings.⁴⁶ The subsequent analysis of the scientific forum identified as one of the major achievements of the Congress "the failure of the strategy of Western agents and reactionary bourgeois science, which banked on the differences of opinion among the socialist countries and had prepared to fuel real and imaginary controversies between them."⁴⁷ However, among the guests at the Congress the most significant group consisted of exponents of bourgeois objectivism, some of whom even

sought similarities between “our concepts” and theirs. N. Todorov judged that it was advisable to establish future contacts precisely with them. The scientific importance of the Congress was recognized in UNESCO’s decision to assign Bulgaria to create an International Center for Research and Documentation on Balkan Studies.⁴⁸

On the whole, the Orwellian rewriting of Bulgarian history was at the core of the structuring of the institutions producing historical knowledge. Directly answerable to the country’s political leadership, the history of their hierarchical structure, of their areas of work, internal organization, reorganizations and general development until 1989 may be viewed in the context of the “mobilizations” for the purpose of rewriting Bulgarian history. The experience acquired in the course of those “mobilizations” served as a basis for and impacted on the institutions in question in the 1990s, too.

However, between the main trends in the post-World War II development of institutions and the development of Bulgarian historiography there is a distinct dissimilarity and even tension. The main tendency in the development of Bulgarian historiography in this period may be defined as follows: first, the elaboration of a concept of scholarly standards in the approach to the past and, second, the establishment of the principles of a professional canon of research. After the mid-1960s, this process is best manifested in the consistent challenge and invalidation of the claims of ideological postulates to exclusive rights to the truth.⁴⁹

The problem of the “historical truth” is crucial in the elaboration of a concept of scholarly standards in Bulgarian historiography. In most cases, this means challenging the monumentality of the ideological “truth” by advancing fragmented “historical truths” attained by the “means and methods of scholarly research.” The latter implies above all individually conducted, strictly empirical studies on concrete subjects (mainly in the field of political history), detailed and based on authoritative documentary sources, confined within unambiguous time frames. Such a concept of scholarly standards and principles of professional work gradually assumed the function of legitimating “true” historical knowledge as apolitical and anti-ideological, while being a marker of the individual identity and professional morality of Bulgarian historians.

The institutional projects for a history of Bulgaria, which after World War II usurped the main function of historical knowledge

in Bulgarian culture—i.e., providing constituents of identity and formation of a national identity and, in addition, Communist education—cannot be identified with the concept of scholarly standards and norms of professional canon sketched out above. They are invariably ideological projects connected with the political—a situation which the acquired and upheld status of expert, individually produced historical knowledge is bound to resist by definition.

This situation lent a special status to particular individuals in the professional community. The personality and works of prominent Bulgarian historians from the late 1960s on combined unproblematically human charisma, “true science,” universally recognized powers of proclaiming “the historical truth,” and, not infrequently, highest institutional positions. The influence of the “new” historians and their “new rhetoric” on Bulgaria’s past often became a corrective to the official ideological and institutional postulates. This influence not only started to bring into hierarchy and deploy in a new way the forces in the official decision-making mechanisms charged with asserting “the historical truth” within the historical community, but also proved capable of integrating into power and successfully mediating relations with power, even “semi-officially” imposing the “historical truth” through its studies. It proved capable of changing key ideological constructs of particular situations in Bulgarian history.

Yet we also think that the situation we have described imposed authoritarian conditions on “the true science of history” and on the professional community, and also determined in an authoritarian way the rules and possibilities of “the historical truth,” as well as precisely who, and in what circumstances, was entitled to articulate that “truth.”⁵⁰ It is very difficult to challenge the “scientific truth” produced by the historical community, because this “scientific truth” is never abstract—in most cases, one can discern behind it personifications of authority, hierarchies in the community, and active human relationships giving substance to the formally established institutional mechanisms. The views of the past, acquired independently of those mechanisms and in other ways, are easy to denounce as “non-scientific” and nonsensical, and the professional community is very critical, even intolerant toward such attempts; such attempts render a scholarly career within this community problematic.

2. THE POST-1989 SITUATION

Since the publication of Maria Todorova's 1992 paper quoted above, there has been a growing interest in the changes and the recent tendencies in Bulgarian historical studies. The publications on this topic have either tried to identify and assess new orientations in the discipline after 1989,⁵¹ or have been part of international projects aiming at comparative accounts of post-Communist historiography.⁵² Recently, a prominent and truly representative forum of Bulgarian historians, the national conference held on 10 November 2004, devoted central attention to the post-1989 development of the profession in Bulgaria. Major new trends relating to thematic fields, methods, as well as the public image of the historical profession, were outlined in all sub-disciplines. Currently, a special issue on "Contemporary Bulgarian Historiography" of the most authoritative (and perhaps the most conservative) scholarly journal, *Istoricheski Pregled*, is in progress. This too comes to prove that the need for a closer reflective scrutiny of the post-1989 development of the discipline is felt.

The most conspicuous thing about the changes in the field of history that occurred (or at least, started) after 1989 was that they went on under the pressure of circumstances outside historiography and not as a result of an inner logic. The present re-writing of Bulgarian history occurred first in public spaces and not inside the academy. It began with street demonstrations and parliamentary debates; it followed the re-writing of biographies and the re-naming of streets; it was undertaken first by the media and newly emerging civic organizations. The pressure of divided and contested memories challenged the position of history as "the only and mandatory memory" (J. Assmann) and urged new readings and new debates. However, it did not, and obviously could not lead to a revolution and paradigm change in Kuhnian sense.

On the one hand, the new demand for historical knowledge in the early 1990s came from diverse new actors on the political stage who sought legitimization through establishing some sort of continuity with pre-1944 political organizations and ideological structures. This called for a reassessment and vindication of political organizations and outstanding politicians from the past (Stefan Stambolov, for instance) previously stigmatized as "reactionary." In some cases, these were put to

political usage, thus incorporating arguments borrowed from history into present political agendas (Stambolov again is a case in point).

On the other hand, the demand for historical knowledge came from broader public circles that demanded "the truth" about all the events and processes that had been misrepresented or altogether unknown before. In the first years after the "tender revolution," there was a rush to overthrow the Communist "master narrative," to hear silenced voices, to restore truth and justice. In its turn, this led to a proliferation to what could be called "popular history," blending history and journalism, often preoccupied with uncovering "hidden truth," and sensationalism. The privatization of publishing in the early 1990s also contributed to the scale and the intensity of this phenomenon. These public attitudes were likely to amplify the sense of 'mission' existing among some historians and stemming from the long tradition of nation-centered and ideologically-laden history writing.

One of the most important and most positive changes after 1989 has been the new accessibility of archives, particularly those of the Communist Party and the Ministry of the Interior. The most serious publication resulting from the opening of the archives is a series of thematically focused collections of documents published by the Central Administration of Archives (*Glavno upravlenie na arhivite*), entitled "The Archives Talk". Twenty-six volumes have been edited to date, among them two volumes with Comintern documents on the "Macedonian question," three volumes of material from the archives of the Bulgarian National Bank, medieval sources, documents on the anti-Communist resistance (1944–1949), the purges in BCP (1948–1953), and other issues and topics.⁵³ The publication of sources on various periods and aspects of Bulgarian history (translated or in their original languages) located outside Bulgaria has been given an impetus by the new opportunities for international collaboration.

Another consequence of the social changes and the public demand for history is the proliferation of memoirs and (auto)biographies. Since the early 1990s, Bulgarian society, like all the other Central and East European societies, has been engaged in what has been called a "feast of remembering." Indeed, biographies and memoirs have been the bestsellers in the field of history. Politicians' memoirs, autobiographies, and diaries seem to form the largest group within the genre. Memoirs

have appeared not only from the inter-war period,⁵⁴ but also from after World War II. Among the authors are not only individuals who suffered Communist repression,⁵⁵ but also outstanding functionaries of the Communist Party, beginning with its leaders Georgi Dimitrov, Vulko Chervenkov, and Todor Zhivkov.⁵⁶ There is a plethora of memoirs by former high ranking officers in the Ministries of the Interior and of Defence, top managers of socialist economy (including former ministers), and other officials. It is noteworthy that contemporary politicians also hasten to publish their diaries and memoirs as soon as they step down from their positions.⁵⁷ Among the authors of memoirs and the autobiographers are a few historians⁵⁸ as well as other intellectuals.⁵⁹ Some journals, like *Makedonski pregled*, set special rubrics for memoirs and documents. It seems that writings in these genres have initiated the tendency towards the reappraisal of recent history. As Rumyana Preshlenova has noted,⁶⁰ this abundance of memoirs demonstrates the prevalence of the instrumentalized individual memory over public, social memory, and corresponds to the lack of new historiographic syntheses. In victims' and eyewitnesses' accounts, history, especially in the first years after 1989, was also seen as a way of remembering what had previously been forgotten/forbidden, as a contested territory of memory. On the other hand, the memoirs and the autobiographies of former Party and state functionaries, most often guided by attempts at self-justification, strive to achieve a "conversion" of their former symbolic capital in the new situation. Premeditated and controlled, these memoirs turn as a rule into official and "objective" accounts of power rather than personal documents. With very few exceptions,⁶¹ memoirs, diaries, and autobiographies have not yet been utilized in historical studies.

The introduction of Western historiography has been a way of overcoming parochialism and acquainting researchers with new approaches and methods. Although a reader edited by Maria Todorova⁶² marked the beginning already in the 1980s, the democratization and the privatization of publishing since the early 1990s has opened new opportunities for Western work in history and the social sciences to be translated into Bulgarian. A number of publishers have made major authors accessible to Bulgarian readers, in particular outstanding representatives of the *Annales* school, such as Fernand Braudel, Marc Bloch, and Jacques Le Goff. Serious authors on nations, national iden-

tity, and nationalism, such as Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner, and Anthony Smith have also become available in Bulgarian. Classics on ancient history are quite numerous, authored by Jean-Pierre Vernant, Peter Brown, and others, as well as established Western authors on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, such as Peter Burke and Georges Duby. Other works related to historical studies such as those of Max Weber, Norbert Elias, Maurice Halbwachs, have also been translated. In addition to the classics, contemporary Western authors offering new approaches or theoretical reflections have been published in Bulgarian.⁶³ Another direction of interest relating to Western historiography is the history of the region: Western works on Bulgarian history and the history of the Balkans have begun to appear in Bulgarian in recent years.⁶⁴ Authors from the region have only occasionally been translated into Bulgarian.⁶⁵ As Maria Todorova notes,⁶⁶ history has been much less susceptible to Western influences than other disciplines. Although one can sometimes detect the influence of Weber's ideas, of Braudel's and Le Goff's topics and research styles, or of Hobsbawm's and Gellner's approaches, the work of Bulgarian historians in general remains insignificantly influenced by innovative Western thought. The bulk of publications do not seem to have benefited from the availability of Western literature in Bulgarian: it garners almost no references or mention in periodicals from the past decade. This situation is likely to last, given the fact that most of the recently translated works—in particular the ones related to theory and method—are seldom included in the reading lists of university courses and remain marginal for history students. The influence of Western authors, references to their books and a critical rethinking of their ideas are indeed present in the work of a few contemporary Bulgarian historians but these are mostly persons from the younger generation who have studied or carried out research abroad.

The rediscovery of Bulgarian historians and intellectuals from the inter-war period is also a noteworthy phenomenon. A number of forgotten texts have been brought to wider attention by being included in readers,⁶⁷ republished, quoted, and studied by contemporary researchers. Thus, the one-dimensional picture of the culture of inter-war Bulgaria has been corrected through the recollection of the names of even marginal authors. In some cases, such as those of Petar Mutafchiev,

Ivan Ev. Geshov, etc. the rediscovery has meant exculpation: authors previously stigmatized as reactionary have been restored to their places of importance and even—quite often—put to new political use.

In the end of this section we would like to draw the attention to a phenomenon, which is neither a “rediscovery” in the above sense, nor a direct response to the public “demand for history.” Nevertheless, it is one of the most important publications at the very beginning of the 21st century, which offers an insider’s view of the recent development of Bulgarian historical studies and its political and public context: the collected papers of an outstanding historian and dissident intellectual, Nikolai Genchev (1931–2000).⁶⁸ For the first time, scholarly papers come out together with comments and discussions on burning issues of politics and culture, evidence of Genchev’s active position in regard to the problems of Bulgarian society and culture in the last decades of the 20th century. Four volumes have been published so far, the first two containing early and otherwise almost inaccessible research papers, while the third and fourth volumes collect all Genchev’s publications in the media till the end of his life. His memoirs written in 1984 and unpublished as yet are forthcoming as the fifth volume of the series. Another volume will contain his unpublished research, which is being edited. A publication of this scope makes it possible to trace important stages of the establishment of the professional canon of Bulgarian history and its scholarly standards in opposition to the ideological conceptualizations of history and the political pressures on historians from the early 1960s to the end of the 20th century.

3. (NEW) THEMES AND DISCOURSES

Many of the new topics and debates entered (or re-entered) academic circles through wider public discussion. A review of the *Nova publichnost* (New Publicity) series—selections of the most reflective and critical debates in the printed media in the course of a year⁶⁹—is evidence of this. Issues of nation and nationalism, of ethnicity and identity, of wars and the Balkans have been raised by both historians and scholars from other disciplines in response to a steady public interest. Discussions concerning history and the writing of history can regularly be found in interdisciplinary journals, such as *Kritika i humanizam*,⁷⁰ and non-academic journals with a broader intellectual orientation, such as

Demokraticeski pregled.⁷¹ On the other hand, even the conservative *Istoričeski pregled* has recently released thematic issues obviously inspired by topics such as former king Simeon Saxe-Coburg-Gotha's election as prime minister in 2001 and the process of EU accession.⁷²

One of the important new themes in contemporary Bulgarian historical studies is of course related to the Communist past. Research on Communist repression has become possible for the first time and this significant blank has attracted a lot of attention. In addition to memoirs—still largely unutilized by researchers, as noted above—publications of documents related to certain persons, events, or processes occupy a prominent place here. An important work in this direction is the above quoted collection of documents aptly entitled “The Trial of the Historians”. The volume contains a number of hitherto unknown documents and gives a fair idea of the atmosphere between 1944 and 1950, and of the debates on university education, on the autonomy of the Academy of Sciences, and on the teaching and writing of history in particular. It proves that, as eminent historian Vera Mutaŭchieva wrote in the Preface, “not always and not in everything did the Bulgarian historians surrender without fighting—heated discussions in departments, academic boards, and editorial offices; punishments and admission of mistakes, explanations to senior institutions, directives and their reminders, banning authors or works (...) The historical front has its own epic history (...) Under the apparent lull on the front [of the science of history], there were dynamic developments (...)”⁷³ Other recently published collections include documents related to the establishment of Party control in culture and literature (e.g. the famous case of eminent writer Dimitar Dimov who was forced to re-write his masterpiece *Tiutium* [Tobacco] in line with “socialist realism”); documents on the anti-Communist resistance in the second half of the 1940s, on the purges in the Communist Party during the Stalinist period, etc.⁷⁴ In addition, a growing number of publications have been appearing based on research of events and persons previously unstudied because of imposed silence and/or the inaccessibility of archives. Works revealing the crimes of the Communist regime in its first years—persecutions of opposition leaders, political prisoners’ camps, the mechanisms of work of the so-called “People’s court”—occupy a prominent place among these.⁷⁵ Another important area of research analyzes the processes of Communist transformation in different sectors: agriculture, education, culture and literature, etc.⁷⁶ The opening

of the archives has played a decisive role for this research which will undoubtedly advance further in the years to come.

Research on totalitarian repression offers the opportunity for reflection on historiography itself: criticism of inadequate method and the enumeration of forbidden topics and inaccessible sources. In his programmatic paper published in 1991, Mito Isusov, then director of the Institute of History at the Academy of Sciences, stressed that the restrictions imposed by the regime on the professional activities of the intellectuals lent these activities an apologetic character, and changed their nature and their goals. Among these restrictions, he listed the so-called “social commissions” (research themes imposed on historians as very important for the society), censorship, repressive measures against dissident intellectuals, and the inaccessibility of the archives of the Communist Party and of the Ministries of the Interior, Defence, and Foreign Affairs. He also outlined the “zones of silence”: Bulgarian–Russian and Bulgarian–Soviet relations, relations with the neighboring countries, positive tendencies in the politics of the bourgeois parties, ambivalent personalities in political life, etc.⁷⁷ Isusov’s paper paved the way for further reflection by historians on the state of their discipline. Repressive acts against historians’ work have been stressed a great deal. At the same time, the methods and standards of the profession have remained unquestioned.

The reassessment of the recent past naturally follows the research on Communist repression; and it constitutes the historians’ contribution to broader intellectual and political debates. One of the hallmarks of the reassessment of the past in Bulgarian historiography today are the efforts to place the Communist past of the country in the framework of a new “grand narrative”. The most actively employed one seems to be that of modernization. Communism as modernization was first analyzed by Dimitar Ludjev.⁷⁸ His paper marked the beginning of a tendency among certain authors towards the historicization of the transition to socialism (as well as the transition that started in 1989) as part of a series of transitions answering the necessity of speeding up or “catching up with” modernization. The most recent and comprehensive work from this group is “The Bulgarian Transitions: 1939–2002” by Evgenia Kalinova and Iskra Baeva.⁷⁹ The book is an ambitious attempt at an encompassing view of Bulgaria’s post-war past from the point of view of the changes that have occurred since then. Beginning with the

post-1944 transition to socialism, it traces the period of so-called “actually existing socialism” (termed “zhivkovism” by the authors in an attempt to capture its specificity) and, finally, the post-1989 transition to democracy and the market economy. The researchers’ attention is focused on the political struggles in Bulgaria, highlighting their dependence on the broader international context of East–West relations during and after World War II and the more specific context of regional developments in the period in question. The international relations and the activities of Bulgarian diplomacy form an important aspect of the book. By and large, they are presented as a consequence of Soviet policies, thus providing further arguments for the authors’ thesis that independence was lacking throughout all Bulgarian transitions. The major transformations in the economy as well as the struggles and the final establishing of Party control over the cultural sphere are also outlined in the book. The authors rely on a substantial body of archival material as well as (mostly recent) research. With its appendices (biographical notes for all prime ministers and the most influential politicians, statistical data, and a chronicle of important events from the period under scrutiny), the book is of great value as a reference work as well.

On the other hand, the interpretations of Communism as a specific type of modernization may infer a certain “normalization” of the Communist period interpreting it as a local/regional variety of a universal process. The conceptualizations and the incorporation of the “Communist transition” into historical or social-scientific explanatory frames may lead away from the condemnation of its crimes (which is certainly not a scholarly task but in such cases seems to be a prerequisite for any scholarly endeavor). Otherwise the claim to value-neutrality in research on Bulgarian Communism can turn—often against the intention of its authors—into a mimicry of certain political values. Therefore, historical (as well as sociological, ethnological, political-scientific, and semiotic) studies of Communism seem to be confronted by a range of questions: is value-neutral research possible, how do conceptualizations relate to (often traumatic) memories, is “historical distance” necessary and how great the distance should be, among other questions. And finally—using Dimitri Ginev’s phrasing from an article cautioning against current social-scientific theorizations of socialism—if the once “actually existing” socialism is to turn into an object of theoretical research, “isn’t the very act of theorization (critical as it may be) a justifi-

catory gesture towards the object"?⁸⁰ This is not to question the worth of research being done, nor to negate the very possibility of such studies, but rather to stress the potential for the "Communist theme" to becoming a focus of reflexive discussion of the methods and the ethos of history.

On the level of empirical research, the reassessment of the past can be seen in the above mentioned emergence of previously ignored ("inconvenient") topics, in the new accents that have been added to the interpretation of "old" topics, this having been previously impossible. Therefore, it is a widely accepted view that the ancient and the medieval history of Bulgaria were comparatively well researched before 1989 and do not need radical re-evaluation. Quite the opposite is the case with modern and contemporary history. There is a consensus among historians that as far as the period after World War I and particularly after World War II is concerned, the ruling Communist Party had imposed its own view on historiography, which led to a distorted picture that has to be overcome now. The impression is, however, that evaluation changes at times from positive to negative or vice versa within the same framework and the same research vocabulary. Although the "neutral" descriptive language can have different implications (including political ones) in different discursive frameworks, the reassessment seems to leave unshattered the belief that the method of history, once established, is not subject to any change, and that it is precisely this method that guarantees the "objectivity" and hence the value-neutrality of "the true science of history."

A new field that actively developed during the past decade—although certainly not a total novelty—is women's history. Research prior to 1989 laid its emphasis on the contribution of women to art and literature, as well as to "national tasks" and the "building of socialism." Research on marriage and family life in the Balkans and in Bulgarian lands under Ottoman rule was also carried out in the 1980s. The revival of interest in the past from the specific perspective of women in the 1990s has stimulated deeper reflection on women's history, and posed the question of its relationship to history in general. Bulgarian "women's history" from the 1990s onwards studies the past "experience" and "representations" of women in the framework of the periods into which Bulgarian history is traditionally divided: ancient, medieval, Ottoman, modern and contemporary. Among the research topics

are the position of women in medieval Bulgaria,⁸¹ the marital status of Christian and Muslim women, family life during the period of Ottoman rule,⁸² the status and activities of Bulgarian women during the so-called "period of the National Revival" (19th century until 1878).⁸³ As far as the modern period is concerned, women's movements in Bulgaria have come into the focus of research⁸⁴ and a major collection of sources on the subject has been published, "From the Shadow of History",⁸⁵ presenting the ideas of women and women's emancipation during a period of almost 100 years (1840–1944) and the growing awareness in Bulgarian society of one of the important problems and projects of modernity—the emancipation of women. The editor of this volume, Krassimira Daskalova, has also studied the position of educated women (teachers, writers, etc.) in the Bulgarian society during the National Revival and in the modern period.⁸⁶ She also published on identity politics, nationalism, and citizenship of Bulgarian women, stressing the discriminatory treatment of female citizens in spite of the presumably universalistic rhetoric of the liberal nation state.⁸⁷ The ambiguities of Communist emancipation have become a thematic field of growing importance for the past couple of years. Although the regime proclaimed constitutional equality between women and men in 1944, women's emancipation was equated in the Communist understanding with granting opportunities for paid work, social protection, and "representation" in some political bodies (e.g. quota in the Parliament) without, however, questioning various other aspects of women's subordinate position within the society and the family. It is precisely these aspects that have attracted the researchers' attention.⁸⁸

Although women's past has become a topic of interest for Bulgarian (mostly female) historians,⁸⁹ feminist history in Bulgaria is still in a nascent state. A starting-point has been set by NGOs such as the Bulgarian Association of University Women and the Group for Research on Women's and Gender History. Both organizations, working from a feminist perspective, are actively engaged in translations and original research in international projects, either focused on gender such as the one on "The Limits of Citizenship"⁹⁰ or including gender dimensions of other processes such as the NHIST (National Historiography) program of the European Science Foundation.⁹¹ Women's history in Bulgaria is an important breakthrough in the still predominantly traditional (i.e. focused primarily on political elites) historical scholar-

ship. Theoretically informed by Western feminism, bordering on areas such as social history, history of everyday life, and oral history, it offers opportunities for innovative research to a growing number of young scholars.

A real and significant change over the last decade is displayed by the fact that minorities have become “visible”—more so in the social sciences, but in history as well.⁹² The process of discovering minorities for academic research has been triggered by the acquaintance of Bulgarian researchers with topical issues in the contemporary social sciences, such as marginality, ethnicity, identity, exclusion-inclusion, commonality-conflict, etc. and enormously aided by international funding programs. Minorities have turned out to be a topic of interest for historians,⁹³ sociologists,⁹⁴ and ethnologists⁹⁵ alike. Translations of both international collections and research on Bulgarian minority policy have also added to the literature on minorities.⁹⁶ The most important center for minority studies during the last ten–twelve years has been an NGO—the International Center for the Problems of Minorities and Intercultural Relations (IMIR) whose founder and director Antonina Zhelyazkova, an Ottomanist, in her studies of Islamization in the Balkans challenged some myths deeply entrenched in historiography. Initially established as an academic institution (1992), IMIR has combined research with activities directed at alleviating the plight of ethnic groups in different locations. Its first publication⁹⁷ was a collective volume problematizing aspects of interethnic and interconfessional relations in Bulgaria, critically scrutinizing century-old stereotypes, and seeking resources for enhancing ethnic and religious tolerance in the Balkans. The volume was a pathbreaking work signaling the start of a series of research projects executed either by IMIR teams or by individual researchers supported by IMIR. In the subsequent years, the Center developed an approach known as “urgent anthropology”—comparatively short visits of interdisciplinary research teams to communities and places in crisis situations. Though sometimes lacking in depth, this approach offers a chance to gain understanding of situations where comprehensive studies are unfeasible or altogether impossible such as the crises in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. The publications prepared and/or supported by IMIR exceed some fifty books. A large part of these are produced by teams of authors with different academic and disciplinary backgrounds. Interdisciplinarity

and the attempt to maintain a comparative perspective constitute a conscious strategy of the Center. Highly representative of its research is the series on "The Fate of the Muslim Communities in the Balkans."⁹⁸ In addition to research on ethnic and religious minorities in Bulgaria, studies of the Bulgarian diaspora and Bulgarian communities in other countries have become a new theme that has been gaining momentum in the past few years.⁹⁹

Religion (in the context of modernity rather than in medieval studies) is another previously neglected topic that has recently attracted the attention of researchers—often in close connection and considerable overlap with the theme of minorities. It is noteworthy that in most recent studies, the history of religion has no longer been regarded as a supplement to political history. Instead of incorporating the history of religion in Bulgaria into the "grand narrative" of the struggle for national independence, as was formerly the case, researchers try to throw into relief the history of the religious communities as possessing its own inherent logic.¹⁰⁰ They analyze the various historical and cultural circumstances of the establishment of these communities and the formation of their own traditions, as well as their interaction with and influence on the surrounding Bulgarian culture. A good example of this influential tendency in post-Communist Bulgarian historiography to view the history of religious minorities from a culturalist perspective is Ivan Ilchev's and Plamen Mitev's book on the early American influences by Protestant missions in Bulgaria.¹⁰¹ The authors build on the fact that the first printed edition of the New Testament in the 19th century was initiated by American Protestant missionaries. The analysis of this fact in relation to the constitution of the official Bulgarian language as one of the nation's pillars is a major focus of the study. Its main importance lies however in the reconstruction of the network of Protestant missions in the Bulgarian provinces of the Ottoman empire, of their positions in relation to the religious struggles of the time, and—most importantly—their contribution to raising the level of education in Bulgarian society through the school network they built. While other studies of foreign educational structures limit themselves to the Ottoman period, this one embraces the first third of the 20th century as well. Its innovativeness consists also in the issues it discusses: the reconstruction of school life, the specific curricula for boys and girls, the "hardships of puberty" in a strict Protestant environment, and other topics.

Ivan Elenkov's book on the so-called "Greek Catholic" church¹⁰² relies primarily on sources comprising the historical record of the community. The focus of the study is on the history of the "Uniates" (as they are most widely known in Bulgaria), but it also touches upon the circumstances whereby the association of many Bulgarians with Rome took place at different moments and upon the processes of the establishment of and the strengthening of all Catholic communities in Bulgaria. Such an approach makes it possible to capture the collective fate of all those who were connected to Rome through their denomination, as well as the different paths of the two Catholic communities in Bulgaria—the Roman one and Greek one. The study aims at an understanding of their cultural differences, shaped in the course of their development and valid to this day.

Choosing a different approach, Svetoslav Eldarov¹⁰³ examines the history of Bulgarian Catholics starting with their division into two denominations and three eparchies. According to him, each of these communities has a different degree of integration and adaptability to the changing circumstances in Bulgaria. He sees the differences in relation to the strategies of establishment and maintenance of the communities, related in their turn to the religious orders engaged in the administrative arrangement and the spiritual life of the respective communities. The Roman Catholic eparchy affiliated with the Order of the Passionists is modelled, according to Eldarov, primarily on the basis of religious practices. The other Roman Catholic eparchy, supported by the Capuchins, is influenced by their intensive cultural, educational, and social activities, which is the reason for defining this model as "cultural." Finally the Greek Catholics (Uniates) follow, according to the author, a "political" model, most vulnerable to the changes in the political situation in Bulgaria. Other authors are also interested in the repressive actions in the early years of the Communist state towards both minority religious communities and the Orthodox church.¹⁰⁴

Popular religion has become a topic of interest and intensive study, also making use of anthropological methods, notably field research.¹⁰⁵ Research projects of this type, informed by historical anthropology and microhistory, have been much more successful in capturing regional features than the hitherto dominant "national" paradigm, and have led to a critical research stance as far as topics of national history and national identity are concerned.

Notwithstanding the changes and the novelties in the thematic orientations of historical studies in post-Communist Bulgaria, the nation still seems to be the dominant discursive frame of historical analyses. More than a decade later, Maria Todorova's remark about the "overwhelmingly didactic character" of Bulgarian historiography and its "obsession with national history" still seems to be quite valid. Gellner's influential idea of nationalism as modernization does not seem to have exerted significant influence on Bulgarian historical studies so far. Critical studies, drawing on Gellner and Hobsbawm, and uncovering the constructed character of Bulgarian national identity, are only beginning to appear, more often than not in publications outside Bulgaria.¹⁰⁶ Such studies are too few to constitute a tendency, as opposed to the dominant nation-centered trends that often see themselves as bearing a "message" for the present, i.e., being in the service of "the Nation," rather than approaching it analytically through problematization and revealing the processes of the constitution of the nation.

Nevertheless, the widely acknowledged formation period of the Bulgarian nation, the so-called National Revival (late 18th–19th centuries)—although a seemingly unquestionable theme of national history—has been put under scrutiny that has led to the deconstruction of central myths. A few innovative studies have appeared recently, offering entirely new perspectives on this topic. It is important to notice that the latter stem from new approaches and interpretations rather than empirical findings. Thus, Dessislava Lilova's book on the "Revivalist meanings of the nation's name," i.e., the ethnonym "Bulgarian,"¹⁰⁷ relies entirely on well-researched material related to the organization of school education for Bulgarian children in the Ottoman empire during the 19th century. This has been a traditionally very high ranking topic in Bulgarian historiography developed in great detail in a number of studies. This book, however, starts once again from the very beginning with the only aim to trace "how the meanings of the name 'Bulgarians' have been formed." Thus Lilova offers an entirely new reading of well-known empirical material, uncovering new and unexpected meanings of the nation formation processes during the 19th century. The author provides sound arguments in favor of her thesis that the pre-modern legacy is not the authentic background of Bulgarian national identity and that the latter has been constructed as part and parcel of the cultural and social order of Bulgarian modernity. Therefore the

task Lilova sets for herself is the identification and description of the basic mechanisms generating different and evolving meanings of the national name. To achieve this, she concentrates on an analysis of the 19th-century publicity structures, beginning with the system of education. The latter, according to Lilova, carried out the classical tasks of every early-modern educational system. However, it functioned within a “non-classical” structure, established and maintained by 19th-century Bulgarian communities—schools which fell out of state control of the Ottoman Empire but depended on local pre-modern elites, with considerable teacher mobility leading in its turn to alternative and competing educational standards, etc. The main feature of this “non-classical” modern system of education was that it was structured as a network rather than a pyramid. That is, due to the lack of centralized state organization, the educational system functioned as a widespread and dynamic network generating the specific meanings of the Bulgarian national name. This network structure of national education was supplemented by the network of public reading centers in communities (the so-called *chitalishte*) and by 19th-century publishing practices relying on sponsorship and subscription. This organization, as Lilova aptly notes, provided for an original plebiscite on the viability and the significance of key ideas organizing Bulgarian national consciousness in the 19th century. School textbooks were also an important medium for the dissemination of visions of national identity. Lilova’s detailed analysis of all schoolbooks in history and geography from the period in question demonstrates the spheres of “gravity,” i.e., the complex interactions and borrowings from “Europe,” but also the resistance to “Europe” in working out strategies for integration of Bulgarian culture into the culture of modernity, for the production of Bulgarian symbolic capital, for the seeking of specific arguments for the distinction of Bulgarians within the Ottoman Empire, and for highlighting their own role and significance.

Another study with no parallel in Bulgarian historiography so far has been Roumen Daskalov’s book¹⁰⁸ on the historical thematizations of the National Revival as a key period in the national grand narrative. This study presents an analysis of the myths, the meanings, and the uses of the term “National Revival” in 20th-century Bulgarian historiography. First of all, Daskalov analyzes the original meanings of the term stemming from its metaphoric use, as well as instances of its oc-

currence in the writings of 19th-century Bulgarian intellectuals. As a next step, the author traces the passage from the range of metaphoric meanings (the Bulgarian word means 'renaissance' as well) in late 19th-century publications to their solidification in a well-established concept with an indisputable meaning in studies throughout the 20th century. The early thematizations of the National Revival as a period of national consolidation and cultural progress have proven, according to the author, to be the most widely accepted and dominant in 20th-century historiography. They have developed the original kernel of meanings while remaining quite close to it. This is parallel with phenomena on a European scale such as the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and the Reformation. However, Daskalov pays considerable attention to other, less stable and lasting interpretations of the National Revival as an "economic and social revival" and a period of "class formation and class struggles." One of the main focuses of the book is the analysis of the movements and the heroes in the light of their later representations and "rankings," as well as the circumstances that have called for radical revisions of the established hierarchies. The last chapter of the book puts forward the thesis of the "continuing revival," i.e., the symbolic struggles around the National Revival from the end of the 19th century, through the attempts of the Communist ideologists to appropriate it, to the post-Communist struggles for the legacy of this most important national myth.

We have devoted considerable attention to these works not because they are "representative" in any way of contemporary historiographic output but rather because of their exceptionality of their innovative approaches to well-established themes and their attempt to step beyond the dominant nation-centered paradigm in Bulgarian historiography. A better established and more influential alternative to the "national" paradigm has been the regional one developed mostly within Balkan studies. There have been fruitful attempts to broaden the perspective by either comparative historical overviews of the countries forming the "Balkan world"¹⁰⁹ or theoretically informed and contextually sensitive analyses of certain issues in the context of two or more Balkan states such as Diana Mishkova's "Domestication of Freedom".¹¹⁰ The book combines a profound knowledge and mastery of an authoritative theoretical tradition in the social sciences with competent handling of a substantial and diversified body of empiri-

cal material. Mishkova takes as her starting point the thesis that the state, with its institutions and ideologies in the processes of belated modernization, plays a central role in the Balkans, where—whatever the differences between countries—the absence of structural and cultural preconditions for a “natural” modernization has been common. Therefore the author focuses on political legitimacy in Romania and Serbia as the central issue of modernization in these societies. She traces the transformation of the very notion of politics as a horizon of meaning for the ongoing processes in the two societies. The richness in detail adds to the “thickness” of the study by making it possible to capture the ambivalences and to follow the connections forming the tissue of the processes in the two countries. However, even when delving into the analysis of specific “cases,” Mishkova demonstrates their commensurability by keeping an eye on the regional context. Highlighting civilizational commonalities that have brought about similar political choices, she challenges the national narrative of exceptionality where the others are always hostile, if present at all. An even greater challenge seems to lie in the abandonment of the idea of “nation” as an axiological foundation in favor of a more difficult dynamic and dialogical approach following the shaky and ever-changing foundations of the legitimacy of national elites.

To sum up: the rare attempts to question the nation as the dominant frame of reference for historical analysis have amounted so far to either making sense of nationalism as a modernization project or revealing its later political uses and appropriations. A systematic challenge of the nationalist historical narrative has come from outside—from the field of cultural studies and literary history engaged in a deconstruction of national myths.

Unlike in critical historiography, the issue of the origin of the Bulgarian people and the Bulgarian nation appears to have become a widely discussed theme—even by authors who have not previously done research on this topic. Indeed, ethnogenesis has repeatedly attracted the attention of historians, more often than not in accordance with specific political circumstances. Nowadays, attempts at rewriting and rethinking Bulgarian ancestry have begun to appear once again. While some of them add to the understanding of the early medieval period and the process of ethnogenesis with no specific message for the present, many others seem to be closer to what might be called “myths of origin” in

Bulgarian historiography. They are not exclusively from the post-1989 years. Such studies existed before and—depending on changing political and intellectual circumstances—tried to foster national identity by providing evidence of the “respectable” origin of contemporary Bulgarians. Thus, at different points in time, one of the three progenitors of the Bulgarian nation came to the fore: proto-Bulgarians in the inter-war period, Slavs after World War II, and Thracians since the 1970s. In a recent paper, Ilia Iliev related the accepted “division of labor” among the three progenitors of the Bulgarian nation—Proto-Bulgarians (war and statesmanship), Slavs (agriculture and family) and Thracians (religion and culture)—to the attempts of Bulgarian intellectuals in the 1970s and the 1980s to construct an autonomous space of their own, independent from state and politics.¹¹¹ These attempts, as shown in Part 1, influenced important aspects of academic work, including the very concept of scholarly standards and notions of professionalism in historical research. The new situation after 1989, naturally, required a new genealogy—one that would symbolically break with the socialist past. Thus, while the Thracian heritage continued to be promoted by archaeology, ancient Bulgarians came back into contemporary Bulgarian historical studies, often within the framework of nationalist or fundamentalist programs.¹¹²

4. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

Positivism and historical materialism have been the two major paradigms dominant in Bulgarian historiography. (The latter has most often been paid lip service only.) The theoretical and methodological innovations since 1989 have amounted at best to a critique of historical materialism and a search for alternatives. For instance, a critique of the principles of historical materialism from the point of view of a history of the “longue durée” was attempted in Ivan Bozhilov’s research on the processes of building the medieval Bulgarian state.¹¹³ However, questions of theory and method do not seem to preoccupy the attention of contemporary Bulgarian historians. Not a single article on these issues has been published in scholarly periodicals during 1990–2001. In addition, the above mentioned principles of professional canon, established in the 1960s, have remained intact: pursuit of the objective historical truth by the methods and means of historiographic research

conforming to scholarly standards. In their non-academic publications and in their interviews, a number of contemporary historians admit that neo-positivist traditions not only persist, but still are very strong in Bulgarian historiography.

Therefore, changes are to be found on the margins of the discipline rather than in the mainstream. This is not to deny that some leading historians do work in innovative ways. Rather, it means that the challenges to the established positivist approach have become possible in the discipline due to the construction of new research objects: aspects and phenomena of the past that have been considered up to the late 1980s uninteresting and unimportant and therefore have been left out of respectable historical research. Thus, new research fields have emerged and new reference systems have been proposed, where long established empirical *massifs* acquire different meanings and make new readings possible.

As far as methods and approaches are concerned, the appearance of “Braudelian” themes, the utilization of “mass” data (registers, fiscal documents), attempts to view the Ottoman period in other than its political aspects, a withdrawal from a “pure” history of events towards a history of institutions,¹¹⁴ and a utilization of sociological approaches¹¹⁵ seem to be the most visible marks of change in Bulgarian mainstream historiography thus far. In this context, Tsvetana Georgieva’s book conceptualizing the spaces of Bulgarians from the 15th to the 17th centuries¹¹⁶ seems to deserve special mention for its attempt to view history as “history of people and of the small groups in which they associate for their life together, as history of society.” Prior to this attempt, for decades on end, the public knowledge of this period had been grounded on ideological conceptualizations of Bulgarian rebellions against the Ottoman conquerors, while professional historians have been preoccupied with social and economic research: the structure of land ownership, the tax system of the Ottoman empire, the position of the Bulgarian *millet* in it, etc. In her attempt to gain a new understanding of this period, the author draws on the *Annales* school and, in particular, on Georges Duby’s ideas of a history of the society based on material structures. Thus Georgieva’s study multiplies the dimensions of historical space—she reconstructs multiple “spaces of Bulgarians” during the early centuries of Ottoman domination. In this respect, first comes the reconstruction of the overall “Bulgarian” space

whose borders are set as a result of scrupulous study and comparison of European sources, data taken from the Ottoman administration, and Bulgarian sources. It is interesting that for Georgieva these borders are not fixed by the exemplarity of a given moment in time; the author manages to capture them in the dynamics of their changes during the whole period under scrutiny. These changes are due to the changing settlement patterns, or—in her own term—the “settlement network varieties” and the predominance of one of these patterns under certain circumstances: “overpopulated valleys,” “mountain settlement varieties,” etc. as well as the migration flows, the formation of urban settlements, etc.

The multiplicity of “Bulgarian spaces” is the second major part of Georgieva’s study. This is an in-depth study of the realities within the overall boundaries outlined in the first part. The author now focuses her attention on the territory of the individual village, its economic relations, its family and kinship structures, and the integration of the individual production units within the socio-economic dimensions of the rural life. A special accent in the conclusion to this part is laid on the inscriptions of memory throughout the village territory. The last part of this innovative study goes back to the major reference points of the 15th, 16th, and 17th-century infrastructure—the sacred places and the urban *topoi*.

An alternative to the predominant political history that has developed in the past few years has been social history, where a number of researchers have undertaken studies related to various periods and thematic fields. Thus, Nadya Manolova tackles a relatively distant and completely understudied phenomenon—the plague epidemics in the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries.¹¹⁷ The book is important as an attempt to place the phenomenon, which has been usually written off to the history of medicine or, at best, considered curious but far from important for the definition of the essential features of the period, in social-historical context. Against such dismissals, the author argues that the plague epidemics have had important social effects and manages to prove her thesis by drawing on a plethora of sources. In particular, these effects had a crucial impact on the network of the settlements in vast regions, determining the oscillations in the reproduction of the population, and, finally, that they have been a major hindrance to the steady flow of migrants into towns and therefore have impeded

the emergence of urban Bulgarian communities throughout the 17th century.

Another interesting effort to redirect the research attention from political clashes, economic crises and military conflicts towards the identification of the sphere of social (i.e., non-political) activities and the distinction between society and the state is Kristina Popova's study on the activities of the Child Protection Union from the inter-war period in Bulgaria.¹¹⁸ Popova's study of the "defeated children" and of the history of childhood in inter-war Bulgaria develops as a counterpoint to the dominant historical narrative of the hardships in the countries that lost World War I. The author introduces new criteria for the selection of the facts incorporated in her work and thus claims the right to a new research optics for historical study. Unlike sentimental traditionalist raptures over the descriptions of motivations for and gestures of charity or the overemphasizing of the state's alleged benevolence, Popova argues that the founders' consistent engagement with the idea of expertise and their insistence on the expert position in their interaction with state authorities and in seeking state assistance for the implementation of the Union's modernizing goals. Thus the organization succeeded in mobilizing broad social circles, creating a network for support of its aims to significantly change the lasting premodern status quo in treating the children and the conditions of their life in Bulgaria. Together with a few other works—e.g., of women's movements (see above), of the social activities of religious organizations, etc.—this study has contributed to the correction of the hitherto prevalent one-dimensional picture of the inter-war Bulgarian society and through the distinction between state and society has provided grounds for further critical scrutiny.

The recent developments in the history of books and reading illustrates the redefinition of a field as a result of the introduction of social-historical approaches under the influence of Western European schools. Following the tradition of Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, what had previously been a field of mainly empirical research following the Russian model of book history, has acquired a new interpretive impetus and has taken a new direction in its development. A reader¹¹⁹ including the first Bulgarian translations of key texts in the field by internationally recognized authors signalled this new orientation. Bringing together different aspects—socio-cultural and organizational, design, printing and book trade—the reader faithfully presents the international and

interdisciplinary character of the field. The gradual re-orientation towards the study of the social and cultural context of the production, dissemination, and reading of books and printed materials, as well as their social impact can be seen in the works of some Bulgarian authors such as Ani Gergova.¹²⁰ She was the leader of the team that carried out a major publication in the field—the *Encyclopaedia of the Bulgarian Book Sector*¹²¹ which not only maps out the expanded field of the history of books, but also traces the new direction of its development with a number of interpretive articles in addition to reference entries.

In the field of economic history, Rumen Avramov's recent book on Bulgarian economy through the 20th century is a rare critical examination of the processes of modernization in the economic sphere for a comparatively long period.¹²² Combining professional expertise with original and critical thinking, the author manages to de-familiarize well-known and somewhat trivial facts about the past (and, to some extent, the present as well). The "plot" of his narrative of Bulgarian 20th century economic development is centered around the dilemmas of imported modernization: industry or agriculture, financial or industrial development, which branches of industry, etc. Avramov uncovers recurrent and basic characteristics under the surface of what seems to be divergent processes and disjointed situations to come to the gloomy conclusion that "all 'economic miracles' in Bulgarian history have come to an end quickly, dramatically and disastrously" as a result not only of the peripheral position and the backwardness of the country's economy, but also of the parochial and inconsistent notions of modernization. This analysis leads the author to the root, as it were, to the basic dilemma: commonality or individualism. The rejection of the latter, according to him, has resulted in a situation where the former "outgrows its purely economic functions and turns into a way of life." Having thus outlined the frames of reference within which the parameters of Bulgarian economic institutionality is situated, Avramov proceeds to analyze the relations between the state and the banking system throughout the 20th century and to reveal the mechanisms enabling corruption on all levels. His assessment of the 20th century economic development in Bulgaria states the lack of "economic memory" of anything but the generation of "spontaneous" socialism; the prognosis of a new beginning is based on the irreversible globalization processes, which do not leave much space for "economic parochialism."

“Cultural history” (to use the locally established term) as a history of ideas is an interesting trend in recent Bulgarian historiography marked by a reflective and context-sensitive approach. A number of publications have brought about a revision of interpretations of the inter-war period as solely a time of class struggle and the maturation of the Communist Party. Rediscovering and reassessing the conservative trends in the intellectual climate of inter-war Bulgaria, they have successfully contributed to the undermining of the previously enforced uniformity in the study of this period.

Ivan Elenkov’s book “Native and Rightist”¹²³ is a reconstruction of the cultural settings in which the idea of the native is discussed as an expression of a “rightist project” critical of modernity and liberalism. The book examines the intellectual experience of war in Bulgarian inter-war culture and analyzes the cultural reflections of the generation that lived through the First World War and transformed its own experience into a cultural potential of “leftist” and “rightist” anti-liberal gestures. The history of right-wing thought in Bulgaria is studied in its deep connection with the history of the mentalities, collective social automatism, and habitual patterns of thought, with the history of “self-perception.” The inter-war debates on Bulgarian cultural identity which generate anti-liberal sentiments are an important source: the debate on the intellectuals’ role in the postwar world of crisis; the debate on “Bulgarian ethnopsychology”; on Bulgarian ethnogenesis and the “Bulgarian race”; the debate on statehood, nation, and their “new revival,” etc. The Bulgarian “right-wing project” is defined as a cultural potential that did not reach the level of doctrinal formulation, a potential radically opposed to both the early Bulgarian liberal projects and the mainstream inter-war political doctrines. However it is also distinct from the traditional definitions of fascism or National Socialism in Europe. The book argues that the core of the right-wing project in Bulgaria is best expressed by the term “native.” The “native” and the “rightist” evolve in close relation to one another during the inter-war period. The “native” is not confined to the aesthetic movement for a “national style in the arts,” nor is it confined to decorative stylizations and imitations of icon-painting, to reproduction of labor, sacrificial or sacred gestures, or scenes of folk festivity. As a potential of the right-wing project, the argumentation of the “native” is imbued with critical sentiments and anti-liberal dispositions, and develops its own Utopian

“teleology” which gradually fosters a readiness for radical encroachments on the prewar liberal order.

Literary, scholarly, and journalistic texts, travelogues and even textbooks from various periods have been re-read and re-assessed from the perspective of the construction of (national) identity and the images of the “other.” Thus, a substantial body of publications has appeared dealing with the images, the notions, the stereotypes of the other Balkan peoples in various sources.¹²⁴ Most often, these publications are the result of joint endeavors of historians with a specialization in the region of Southeast Europe and historians of literature. They try to capture the dynamics of collective identities and the mythologies surrounding them. The latter are discovered in the scholarly works of historians, philologists, ethnographers, in the writings of journalists, as well as in textbooks, literature, and folklore. The growing body of these studies covers the period from the 18th to the 20th century with a special accent on Balkan nationalisms and minorities. Recently, scholars from neighboring countries have also joined some of these projects, and a few related international symposia were held. In the context of the notions of the “desirable” and “undesirable” (or: “prestigious/unprestigious”) other, and of the construction of Bulgarian identities in comparison with or in opposition to these “others,” reconstructions of the ideas of “Europe” and related discourses¹²⁵ in various intellectual and public circles have begun to appear, which form an interesting body of research, albeit varying in depth and sometimes closer to journalism.

Historical anthropology¹²⁶ has been systematically introduced for more than a decade, thanks to a lasting and fruitful partnership between the Center for Balkan Studies at the South-Western University Blagoevgrad and partners from the Universities of Graz and of Vienna. Annual international seminars stimulate exchange and further research in the fields of the history of everyday life, mentalities, gender, family, etc. One of the innovative pieces of research in this respect is Rayna Gavrilova’s study of the history of everyday life in the period of the National Revival¹²⁷—a thorough study of housing, cuisine, clothing, the festive cycle, and the life cycle of the urban population. The book marks a radical departure from the heroic emplotments of the traditional national narrative of this period. It is a genuine encyclopaedia of 19th century urban life that brings important corrections into the literature about the dynamics of the changes associated with the mod-

ernization of Bulgarian society during the period in question. Gavrilova's analysis convincingly outlines the ways in which the structures of everyday life (usually ignored by the authors focused on the national liberation struggles) prove to be determinative of the basic features of urban Bulgarian culture throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th century. In its three parts, this comprehensive study offers thick reconstructions of the temporal cycles of urban life: the day ("From morning till night"), the week ("From Monday to Friday") and the life cycle—childhood, youth, everyday roles in family life, the day-to-day concern with one's own death and that of others, with the decent passage to the other world, as well as with the sacredness of the holiday ("From the beginning to the end"). The book deals with "bread and sleep, love and sin, vanity and death" in their most ephemeral and rapidly dissolving everyday forms, which are, however, furthest from the obliqueness and the theoretical self-awareness of ideologies that try to explain and fix the meaning of human life. Gavrilova's study restores the fading memory of co-existence and cultural exchange in the early urban community in Bulgaria and reinstates the primordial meanings of cultural gestures valid to this day.

Anthropological and historical perspectives are combined in a number of projects that focus on regions and specific places¹²⁸ and on women's history and family life (see the notes to this paper's section on women's history). Different aspects of everyday life and culture are handled in a convincing way by Ivan Ilchev in his study on advertising in 19th-century Bulgaria.¹²⁹ However, the author's idea that everyday life fully deserves the historians' attention has obviously failed to convince the majority of the historians. It is quite likely that the interest in the study of everyday life and the acceptance of a historical-anthropological stance, first developed by scholars of the Ottoman period, corresponds to the lack of many nationally significant political events and persons in that period.

Among the new paradigms that have attracted the attention of researchers are oral history and the life-story method, with their potential for handling a variety of themes such as Communist repression, the forced change of Turkish names, minorities (especially Bulgarian Muslims), women's experiences, popular religion, everyday life and life course, and cultural stereotypes that emerge in the language and style of narrations. Two international conferences on oral history and

the life-story method were held in 1994 and 1999; teams of university teachers and students have been working with those methods for several years at the Universities of Blagoevgrad and Sofia;¹³⁰ several collections of life stories have been published.¹³¹ It is noteworthy that oral history has been developed by interdisciplinary teams, with representatives of linguistics and sociology working together with historians. The newly-emerged field has been mapped out by interdisciplinary and international influences: German *Biographieforschung* (Fritz Schütze, Gabriele Rosenthal), French sociology working with *récits de vie* (Daniel Bertaux), and British oral history (Paul Thompson). Research has been published in journals marginal to the discipline of history, such as *Bulgarski folklor*,¹³² *Balkanistic Forum*,¹³³ and *Sociologicheski problemi*.¹³⁴ Until recently, oral history was either dismissed or criticized by “mainstream” historians.¹³⁵ Lately, however, there are certain signs that the situation may be gradually changing and oral history has been gaining recognition both within the profession and (most importantly) outside it: a variety of institutions have launched projects based on oral history and personal documents (the Historical Museum in Rousse, the Ivan Hadjiiski Institute in Sofia, the project “I have lived through socialism”¹³⁶ etc.).

A recent publication both relying on oral history methods and inquiring into their specificities and limits is Daniela Koleva’s “Biography and Normality”.¹³⁷ The book starts by tracing the institutional factors that have contributed to the formation of what might be called the “normal biography” in Bulgaria. The prerequisites of this “institutionally designed” normality are found in the laws on school education, on social security, and on poor relief—the state’s instruments for defining the major phases and passages during the individual life course. Next, the study proceeds with an analysis of the actual perceptions of one’s own life as found in a body of some 150 life stories of (mostly) elderly persons. The horizon of everyday competences, expectations, and assumptions, as well as the space of cultural stereotypes related to the notions of “normal life,” is thus outlined and therefore are the contours of what might be termed “socially valid” normality, (partly) alternative to but significantly determined by the institutional project. The ways the narrators conceptualize their lives, the metaphors they use, their rhetorical devices, and the genres of their stories are paid special attention in order to gain understanding of their self-perceptions and self-judgements in relation to accepted models. Thus the book attempts to

make sense of the influence of the institutional arrangements and the cultural context on the apprehension of one's own life and the notions of the desirable (the "normal") course it should take. The potential of oral history and biographical methods in the study of issues such as gender and minorities has drawn researchers' attention. Nevertheless, the field is not yet developed, particularly as far as questions of theory and method are concerned.

Although there certainly are authors working from an interdisciplinary perspective and conceptualizing their subject in original ways, this can hardly be taken to signify a general trend. Conservatism, partly resulting from a narrow definition of disciplinary boundaries, still prevails in Bulgarian historical studies, as far as both methodology and theoretical frameworks are concerned. Therefore, interdisciplinary influences, insofar as they exist, can point to another way of innovation in historiography and of overcoming its parochialism. In the following, some relevant developments related to the neighboring disciplines are mapped out: Balkan studies (an institutionally separate branch of history, rather than a separate discipline), sociology, ethnology, and literary studies. This is an indispensable task, given the narrow conception of historiography that still persists in Bulgaria: it is reduced almost exclusively to political history, with a number of fields and themes falling outside of its scope.

The political ranking of research priorities in history and the social sciences before 1989 led to a peculiar "hierarchy" of research fields and related disciplines. Thus, history came to be regarded as primarily political history, military history, and the history of diplomacy. Social history was reduced to a history of class struggle and workers' movements, and cultural history to history of art and folklore as separate disciplines, assigned to different institutions. An important thematic field related to the broader Balkan context and calling for a comparative perspective was separated as Balkan studies (see Part 1). This "division of labor," backed by the respective institutional differentiation, continued after 1989 preserving to a large extent the previously established narrow concept of history.

Sociology seems to be significantly more open to both the reception of Western ideas and interdisciplinary projects. Sociologists appear to be interested in the methodological problems of contemporary historiography, much more so than historians themselves. Suffice it to say

that the French *Annales* school was introduced in a reader compiled by sociologist Liliana Deyanova, and a special issue of the journal *Sotsiologicheski problemi* (3, 1996) featured the topic "History and Sociology," with Jacques Revel and François Furet among its contributors. One of the major topics of Bulgarian sociology today—modernity and modernization—has direct historiographic relevance. The topics of interest range from modern rationality and science, intellectuals and elites, to the relationship between political and economic modernization, between modernization and nationalism, etc. These research problems represent an overlapping of the spheres of historical and social-scientific research. Another important common topic is memory: the way the past (above all, the Communist past) is handled and incorporated into the present. Oral history and the tradition of biographical research in sociology overlap here and open prospects for interdisciplinary research that have not yet attracted sufficient attention. Globalization and Balkan identity, ethnic minorities and their integration, and feminist studies and the history of women are other topics of interest to both historians and social scientists that are tackled by sociology.¹³⁸

Ethnology and folklore studies are two other neighboring disciplines with relevance to historiography. Drawing on the classical German tradition of *Volkskunde*, ethnography in Bulgaria has devoted its attention since its outset to the language, history, and tradition of Bulgarian people. During the past decades a curious split has been observed in the field: ethnology (till recently "ethnography") and folklore studies coexist and develop almost independently of one another. The differences are in the approach and focus of research, in institution and background. Ethnologists with a background in history are predominantly affiliated with the Institute and Museum of Ethnography at BAS, while most folklorists (affiliated with the Institute of Folklore at BAS) have a background in Bulgarian language and literature. Hence the former are methodologically better "equipped" for studying the so-called "material culture," as well as socio-normative culture, kinship, and power relations, while the latter tend to look at the symbolic dimension of their objects of study. Two journals, *Bulgarska etnologia* (*Bulgarska etnografia* until 1995) and *Bulgarski folklor* have been coming out independently for some fifteen years. More recent are the internationally oriented *Ethnologia Balkanica* and *Ethnologia Bulgarica*. An overview of the journal *Bulgarska etnologia* shows the relevance of this

field to the study of history, and confirms the observations made in the beginning of this section about the narrowing of the field of history. Most authors trace their topics back to the beginning of the 20th century, sometimes even earlier,¹³⁹ making up for what has been developed in other countries as social history. Only during recent years has there been a gradual shift of interest towards the recent socialist past and the present,¹⁴⁰ as well as a more reflective attitude to concepts and method. Folklorists have followed a more coherent paradigm, that of French structuralism. Nevertheless, their work has a historical dimension as well. It can best be seen in the work on some of their central themes: the socialist past, minorities etc. What is worth noting about the research and the publications of many folklorists is their standing interest in method. Several issues of the journal *Bulgarski folklor* have published on biographical method, on narrative, on diversity and its representation etc.¹⁴¹

Interesting processes have been going on for the last years in a previously nonexistent space of research between history and literary studies. Recent studies, mostly by literary scholars and historians of literature, relate their subjects to a broader cultural context aiming at a deconstruction of national myths and stereotypes reproduced and reinforced in popular literary works. They demonstrate the ways of privileging certain themes, periods, events, and persons and uncover the fabrication of Bulgarian national mythology in the period of the so-called National Revival.¹⁴² In this respect, Inna Peleva's radical re-reading of the poetry and journalism of Hristo Botev (1848–1876), an outstanding intellectual and leader of the national revolutionary movement has proven to be a path-breaking work. The author's starting position is her disagreement with the consensus that "the figure of a national idol requires mandatory continuity and stability of the meanings inscribed to it" and that the idol's "task of generating integrative energies in space and time (...) calls for a quite fixed contract regarding the reading, the understanding, and the 'translation' of the name 'Botev' and of whatever that name metonymically suggests."¹⁴³ Therefore Peleva sets out to fully reconstruct those aspects of Botev's work that have been left out of the "high" literary and historiographic readings of the texts of the "national idol." Her aim is to identify in these texts not only the long-acknowledged appeals to freedom, fraternity, and equality, legitimizing precisely the type of eschatology of the Bul-

garian national revolution that seems acceptable from the point of view of European culture, but also—and most importantly—to identify the “dark discursive doubles” of those glorious appeals and to reconstruct the “ardent primitiveness of the savage thought” in the national revolt, which has been omnipresent in Botev’s works but has been systematically left out by the interpretive canon. This aim, in our opinion, has been achieved in a most convincing way.

5. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

If we assume—as we already have—the importance of institutional settings for the establishment and the sustainability of research orientations and paradigms, we have to look closely at the institutional contexts of the changes that occurred (or failed to occur) in the field of historical studies. Although the Departments of the History of the Communist Party and the History of the Soviet Union were disbanded, as was AONSU (the Party-sponsored Academy of Social Sciences and Social Management), the key institutions for the production and dissemination of historical knowledge have continued their existence after 1989 with only minor changes of structure and personnel. A shift in activities has been observed however, with research increasingly moving from BAS institutes to the universities. The latter proved more flexible in trying to adapt to the new situation by introducing new subjects and engaging in international projects. However, university education in history—in particular at the undergraduate level—as a rule has followed quite rigid disciplinary lines. The universities have also managed to attract BAS personnel as teachers; severe budget cuts at the Academy has made this an easy task. Ph.D. students have been trained both at BAS institutes and at the universities.

The real novelties since 1989 have appeared largely outside the traditional institutions, with the establishment and activities of new organizations, such as the International Center for the Problems of Minorities and Intercultural Relations (IMIR), the Center for Advanced Studies¹⁴⁴ with its History Workshop, the Bulgarian Association of University Women, and other NGOs supporting and developing research activities in historiography and the social sciences. New paradigms, such as cultural history, historical anthropology, oral history, and feminist history, as far as they can be found in the production of knowledge about the

past, are largely linked to the appearance of these and other similar new structures, some of which are affiliated with academic institutions. The most important change, as we see it, is the formation of alternative perspectives and alternative levels of handling the past, which significantly contribute to overcoming the hitherto prevailing one-dimensionality. It is most likely at these levels, rather than in mainstream historiography, that the greatest potential for change is to be found.

The lack of resources has brought severe crises to the periodicals in the field of historical studies. At the same time, the liberalization of publishing and the changing structure of funding, which no longer originates from state sources only but also from a number of private and public Bulgarian and international bodies, including translation programs, have become a precondition for the appearance of new periodicals and series in history and related fields.¹⁴⁵ At this stage, it doesn't seem to be possible to make any major distinctions among them related to approach or paradigm.

On the whole, different organizations related to history and history writing have proliferated for the last fifteen years. A number of them have done a lot to introduce new topics and discourses in a critical and self-reflective way, others have launched nationalist or fundamentalist programs. What is curious about such "para-historical" formations in Bulgaria today is that they are quite powerful, are recognized and supported by leading historians, and are capable of supporting the publication of research—old and contemporary—that is in line with their programs.

An overview of the institutional context for the production of historical knowledge confirms, in our opinion, the thesis of the paramount importance of institutional continuity and change for the continuity and change of paradigms and research styles. The efforts and achievements of individual researchers, however innovative, cannot bring about significant and lasting changes within the old structures where a reproduction of hitherto dominant methods and styles prevails. Furthermore, the very concept of scholarly standards in history, as well as criteria for professionalism, depend, as we tried to show in Part 1, on institutional support and institutional continuity. Therefore, if we are to look for schools and paradigms, that is, for a "critical mass" and not for separate individual achievements, the role of institutions and policy-makers cannot be ignored.

6. THE DEBATE ON FASCISM: A CASE STUDY ON THE CONDITION AND PERSPECTIVES OF BULGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

The debate on fascism will be considered at some length because it is, in our opinion, paradigmatic in several respects for the understanding of the present situation and dynamics of Bulgarian historiography. The choice is logical, considering that the debate was at the core of a permanent (implicit or explicit) discussion throughout the second half of the 20th century. Its outburst in recent years is an illustration of the way in which post-Communist historiography responds to broader changes in the public sphere and how the latter triggers historical debate. Furthermore, being a scholarly response to a political debate, the debate on fascism is the Bulgarian historians' demonstration of the expert status of their discipline, where a reconstruction of the past based on empirical and positivistic methods is set against ideological dictates. Therefore, the debate on fascism, as we see it, proves to be a discussion about the condition and tasks of contemporary Bulgarian historiography. With its analysis, we hope to relativize the above division of pre- and post-1989 situations and to uncover an essential source of continuity in Bulgarian historical studies.

The constantly simmering debate has flared up in several direct disputes. The first was held between 17 November 1965 and 1 February 1966. Thirteen papers by participants in this discussion were published in the journal *Istoricheski Pregled* (from no. 6 of 1966 to no. 1 of 1969). The second discussion took place from 8 to 11 October 1968. Its subject was "The Nature of the 19 May 1934 *Coup d'État*", but fascism in Bulgaria served as the common framework of all commentaries. The debate was initiated by the Institute for the History of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) at the Party's Central Committee, i.e., at a privileged institutional level. The third discussion, organized by the Institute for Balkan Studies, took place in a calmer and definitely academic environment. It was held on 25 and 26 April 1983 and was designed to cover a broader research field than the preceding ones. Fascism as a subject of analysis was not confined to Bulgaria alone, and the discussion covered its forms of development and its manifestations in a Balkan context.¹⁴⁶ The very end of the 1980s saw several publications on the subject, which were not related to any particular initiative.¹⁴⁷

Immediately after the fall of Communism, at the beginning of 1990, the subject exploded in the public sphere through the arguments of irreconcilable political confrontation. In the passionate inquiry into "Was there fascism in Bulgaria?" a negative answer seemed to be taken for granted and did not actually refer so much to fascism as to a categorical denunciation of the Bulgarian Communist Party's past, present, and future.¹⁴⁸ The opposite thesis was upheld by those who had fallen from power as an argument and justification for their deeds after World War II.¹⁴⁹ Only one scholarly article appeared, the fervent, clear, and polemical tone of which can be regarded as a remote echo of the extreme positions in the public sphere.¹⁵⁰ In a reply published several months later, it was noted that the achievements of Bulgarian historiography in the twenty-five years that had passed since the first discussion called for a reconsideration.¹⁵¹ However, the core of the discussion among professional historians in 1989 and 1990 remained confined to the above-mentioned publications.

In 1996, the journal *Demokrateski pregled* launched a discussion entitled "Fascisms in Bulgaria and Across the World."¹⁵² Researchers from different generations and with different political orientations were invited to participate. They replied to ten questions on the subject. Four of the participants contributed separate papers.¹⁵³ Those are the main facts that constitute the history of the discussions on fascism in Bulgaria in the second half of the 20th century.

The systematization of studies on the subject, i.e., their historiographic description and analysis, dates from the early 1980s and is entirely associated with the work of one of the leading historians of fascism in Bulgaria, Nikolai Poppetrov. From 1982 to 1993, Poppetrov published four papers devoted to various aspects of research on the subject.¹⁵⁴ The most detailed among them, published in 1986, identifies three stages in research until the mid-1980s. The first stage is the period from the end of World War II to the end of 1940s. The bulk of studies on fascism from that period should be examined in the context of political propaganda. This stage saw a proliferation of major ideological clichés that persisted right until, and even after, the fall of Communism.¹⁵⁵ The appearance of the first systematic studies based on the methods of historical research from the late 1940s and early 1950s marks the beginning of the second stage. Poppetrov associates the end of this stage with the discussions in the late 1960s and the

early 1970s, which he regards as indicating the level of the science of history in general. The third stage spans the period from the 1970s to the early 1980s. Poppetrov marks this as very different from the previous two in both quantitative and qualitative terms. This is the period in which research on fascism in Bulgaria built an impressive database; the first fundamental studies outlining the forms of manifestation of concrete fascist organizations and movements date from that time. The author draws the important conclusion that at the stage in question, the achievements of civil history helped make the subject of fascism independent from the dominant perspective of viewing the inter-war period and World War II as a privileged domain of the history of the Communist Party, the workers' movement, and the antifascist resistance. Poppetrov notes that the period attests to a tendency towards theoretical generalization, as well as towards situating Bulgarian fascism in a Balkan and European context. Also, it appropriately qualifies the achievements from the 70s and early 80s as a bridgehead, "a preparatory stage towards a new conceptual generalization and a new picture of Bulgarian fascism that corresponds to historical development."¹⁵⁶ In 1986 this was undoubtedly a bold thesis and an explicit definition of the main tendency in the development of research on modern Bulgarian history—a tendency towards surmounting the absolute ideological norm, according to which fascism was the broadest definition of the inter-war period.

The challenge of ideological concepts is the main drama and the leading story line in the observations on the development of research on fascism in Poppetrov's excellent historiographic studies. Its denouement came in 1993: "The end of the 'classical' theory of Bulgarian fascism is an unquestionable fact." Poppetrov wrote:

The studies of a series of researchers from the early eighties led deliberately or involuntarily towards the invalidation of this theory. In the field of civil history, Bulgarian historical science has accumulated a vast amount of facts, the processing and analysis of which show clearly that the contradiction between the dogmatically upheld general scheme of Bulgarian fascism as a main current in bourgeois reaction after the end of the World War I and scientific achievements on concrete themes, has entered a crucial stage in its denouement.¹⁵⁷

Now we shall proceed to explain why we consider the debate on fascism in Bulgaria particularly revealing for the analysis of post-Communist historiography. This debate was actually a specific case in the process of forming of a concept of scientific standards and the legitimizing of the professional, non-political status of the science of history. And if the 1990s saw the end of the dispute with the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideological dogma in the theory of fascism, the last decade of the 20th century neither was nor could have been a watershed in regard to scientific standards and professional principles of historical research that were formed in the course of the preceding period.

The debate on fascism consistently challenged the monumentality of the ideological "Truth" by advancing fragmented "historical truths" attained by the "means and methods of scientific research." The latter implies detailed, strictly empirical studies on concrete subjects confined within unambiguous time frames, and based on authoritative, mainly documentary, sources. Their positive effect was the gradual populating of the inter-war past with subjects of Bulgarian history: institutional order functioning according to an established logic, a structured political system transformed dynamically under the pressure of variable circumstances, responsible individuals, etc. In the course of the entire debate on fascism, claims to scientific standards and professionalism were declared by announcing long lists of absent studies, i.e., studies that should have been conducted but were not—an argumentation technique which, on the one hand, limited the validity and restricted the range of ideological qualifications and, on the other, paved the way for future studies in line with the gradually asserted scientific standards.

The most detailed list of "blanks" in the research on fascism in Bulgaria is offered by N. Poppetrov in his 1986 paper. Vladimir Migeв's response in 1990 also started with the typical conviction of the expert historian about the absence of important segments of research on the period and of in-depth empirical reconstructions that could serve as a basis for the "truth."¹⁵⁸ Notwithstanding the acknowledgement of certain major achievements, the invariable complaint about the persistent lack of research was voiced openly in the discussion launched by *Demokraticheski Pregled* in 1996. The deep dissatisfaction with the progress of research, expressed by all participants, revealed the consensus on the approaches to the study of fascism in Bulgaria, irrespective of their generation-based and political differences. In other words, differ-

ing opinions on fascism were nonetheless based on a consensus on the principles of professional work and scientific standards.¹⁵⁹ Whence the infinite dissatisfaction of historians studying fascism in Bulgaria, and why are they never content with progress in this field?

The line of scientific inquiry, established in the late 1960s and early 1970s consistently limited the scope of the ideologized concept of “fascism.” Studies along this line gradually filled the inter-war situation with concrete facts that invariably disproved the ideological premises of that concept. If at the beginning of the debate “fascism”; “monarcho-fascist dictatorship” and other concepts of this kind were called into question as a total designation of the inter-war period, along with the fascist “nature” of particular regimes, from the 1980s onwards the term “fascism” was particularized and came to be associated with specific movements, organizations and even individuals, and inquiries concentrated on the extent to which a particular formation or regime could be identified as fascist. Thus the focus was shifted from the general concept to the concrete aspects of manifestation of the phenomenon.

Here we come back to the above-mentioned thesis that if the 1990s saw a denouement in the dispute with the ideological dogma, the last decade of the 20th century was not a watershed in regard to the scientific standards and professional principles of historical investigation. This explains our preoccupation with the pre-1989 debate—what happened in the 1990s actually resulted from the established and much earlier tendency in research on modern and contemporary Bulgarian history. The long list of absent studies did not promise a turnaround in the chosen direction of work in the short run—furthermore, the victory and superiority over ideology confirmed the triumph of the “scientific truth”. Nor should we forget that in the context of post-1989 passions in the public sphere, precisely such a concept of scientific standards and professionalism again had quite a few reasons to uphold its claims to implement concrete and sober observation. The debate on fascism in the 1990s did not lose its function of once again legitimizing the non-political status of the expert study of history.

The concept of scientific standard described above does not have a viable alternative, and it (still) produces the “only” “scientific truth” about Bulgaria’s past. The disintegration of the totalizing ideologized perspective on history through the historiographic fragmentation of narratives does not mean plurality of approaches to the past, but rather

uni-dimensionality. The established concept of scientific standards and the principles of the professional canon do not presuppose any plurality of perspectives on history. The dispute with the totalitarian truth was the focus maintaining the common story line of fragmented narratives and determining their common meaning. The end of the totalitarian truth was also the end of the common meaning of those fragmented narratives, after which they started dispersing without a meaning of their own. The lofty claim to scientific standards has come to acquire a status similar to that of “art for art’s sake.”

7. CONCLUSIONS

Regardless of topic and period, Bulgarian historical studies have been highly consistent as to their approach and methodology. Concerned to emancipate itself from ideology (insofar as such an emancipation was possible at all), historical science relied mostly on positivistic methods. The standards of expertise in historiography implied loyalty to the facts (i.e. their discovery and description) rather than to interpretative frameworks. Thus, the pursuit of greater professionalism, which very often turned into a flight into minute and scrupulous empirical studies, became the landmark of historians’ professional ethos. Ideology was silently opposed by “factology.” On the other hand, the claims of history to the position of *magistra vitae*, that is, to carrying a message for the present, brought it in dangerous proximity to ideology, which it sought to avoid. Thus the oscillation between science and ideology, between academic standards and political agendas has been a hallmark of Bulgarian historiography during all periods of its development. The tension between the scholarly ethos and the necessity to “serve the nation” was present in both the pre-1944 period and the Communist period. It can be observed in the last fifteen years as well. The changes after 1989 demand a legitimization and rethinking of the past, and history is best adapted to the purpose. Thus, the claims of science and those of politics clash once more. “Science” has, however, been largely understood in the positivistic sense, and not as a critical stance towards myths and ideologies.

Against the backdrop of the overall change in society, the changes in the field of historical studies do not seem to be profound. The efforts of organizing and publishing previously inaccessible archival ma-

terials have been accompanied by scanty interest in new methods. The standards of the profession have remained unchallenged. The criteria of professionalism developed before 1989 in opposition to the “method” of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism have survived the collapse of the Communist paradigm. The search for “historical truths” argued in a positivistic framework has persisted, although there is no longer an ideological Truth to be opposed and relativized. The main institutions for the production of historical knowledge have also remained largely intact. Institutional continuity has brought about a continuity of paradigm and research style and has impeded pluralism. Within the same paradigm, a reassessment of ideas, events, and personalities has taken place, which has countered hitherto dominant ideologically biased evaluations. New topics have emerged: on the one hand, previously silenced themes; on the other, new directions of interest often resulting from contact with Western research. However, it is difficult to question the monophonic “historical truth” within the very same basic institutions generating knowledge of history, with their preserved and reproduced internal structure. When everyone takes an identical view of history, this means that the present does not offer any opportunities for cultivating a sensitivity to the plurality of views across the infinite realm of history.

NOTES

- 1 The research for this paper was partly conducted in the context of two projects: the international project ‘Historiography in Southeast Europe after Communism’ funded by the Austrian Ministry of Education, Science and Culture and led by the Center for the Study of Balkan Societies and Cultures [See: Brunnbauer (ed.), *(Re)Writing History. Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism.*] and Ivan Elenkov’s participation in the NEXUS programme of the Center for Advanced Studies in Sofia (www.cas.bg). We are indebted to Krassimira Daskalova, Diana Mishkova, Ilia Iliev and the participants of the History Workshop at CAS for their comments and suggestions.
- 2 Hadjinikolov, “Polovin vek spisanie Istoricheski Pregled,” 14–5. The journal publishes annual lists of new books and articles where the thematic *foci* become clearly visible.
- 3 Todorova, “Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria” 1116.

- 4 Donkov, "Sto godini spetsialnost istoriya v Sofiyskiya universitet 'Sv. Kliment Ohridski,'" 27.
- 5 Todorova, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria," 1113.
- 6 Markov, "50 godini Institut po istoriya pri BAN" 3.
- 7 Mateev, "Edinniyat tsentur po istoriya pri BAN prez 1972 g.," 144.
- 8 *Istoricheski Pregled*. 3–4, 1999, 277.
- 9 "Predlozhenie ot otdel 'Agitatsiya i propaganda' do Politburo", 461–2.
- 10 Vassilev, "Akademik Dimitar Kossev kakuvto go vidyah i zapomnih", 105–29.
- 11 "Reshenie na Politburo na CK na BKP za mnogotomna istoriya na Bulgaria", 3–6.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 6.
- 14 Mateev, "Edinniyat tsentur po istoriya pri BAN prez 1972 g.," 147.
- 15 Vassilev, "Rabotata po istoriya na Bulgaria na nov etap", 130.
- 16 Donkov, "Sto godini spetsialnost istoriya v Sofiyskiya universitet 'Sv. Kliment Ohridski'", 35.
- 17 Vassilev, *ibid.*, 134.
- 18 For a more comprehensive analysis see: Elenkov, *The Science of History in Bulgaria in the Age of Socialism*.
- 19 Stenograma ot suveshtaniето na istoritsite, organizirano ot Komiteta za naouka, izkoustvo i kultura za obsuzhdane sustoyaniето na istoricheskakata naouka, mart-april 1948. In Mutafchieva et al. eds., *Sudut nad istoritsite*, 205.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 280–1.
- 21 Vassilev, "Obsuzhdane na porazheniyata, naneseni ot culta", 142–153.
- 22 There is a pathetic explanation for the delay of volume 3 of the revised two-volume *History of Bulgaria* (covering the period from 1917 to the early 1960s). Scheduled for submission to the publishing house on 1 June 1961, at a meeting of the team of authors on 21 November 1962 the "delay" of the manuscript was explained by the need to "wait for the resolutions of the 8th congress of the BCP, so as to be given the main guideline in the revision of the volume...." in *Protokol ot zasedaniето*, Scientific Archives of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS), holding 88, inventory 2, archive unit 71, sheet 32.
- 23 Back then Kossev declared: "The working class and its historians have no reason to fear the historical truth because it is on their side. That is why fabrication of historical facts should not be permitted in any circumstances." In Vassilev, *ibid.*, 143.
- 24 *Vtoro natsionalno suveshtanie na istoritsite v Bulgaria. Stenografski protokol*. Scientific Archives of the BAS, holding 88, inventory 2, archive unit 74, sheet 65.
- 25 *Ibid.*, sheet 66.
- 26 *Ibid.*, sheet 68.

- 27 Kossev, op. cit., 27.
- 28 Todorov, "Sustoyanie i zadachi na bulgarskata istoricheska naouka", 16.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 18.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 19.
- 31 Todorov, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria' v Suvetskiya suyuz", 116–26. (1954)
- 32 Tupkova-Zaimova, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria'", 108–16.
- 33 *Reshenie na PB na CK na BKP*. 18 March 1955, Central State Archives of the Republic of Bulgaria, holding 1b, inventory 6, archive unit 2492, sheet 1.
- 34 Todorov, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria'", 116–25. (1955)
- 35 Hadjinikolov, "Naouchnite diskousii v Institouta za bulgarska istoriya pri BAN", 359.
- 36 Vassilev, "Obsuzhdane na porazheniyata, naneseni ot kulta", 147.
- 37 *Pravilnik za zakritite naouchni trouдове*. Central State Archives of the Republic of Bulgaria, holding 1b, inventory 36, archive unit 1377, sheet 25.
- 38 Stoyanov, "Seksiya 'Istoriya na bulgarskiya natsionalen vupros'", 84–90.
- 39 *Dokladna zapiska do PB na CK na BKP*. Central State Archives of the Republic of Bulgaria, holding 1b, inventory 36, archive unit 3341, sheets 1–7.
- 40 Genchev, "Ouchitelka na zhivota, no koga?", 6.
- 41 Kossev, Angelov, Bouzhaski, et al., "Osnovni etapi v razvitiето na bulgarskata istoricheska naouka sled Vtorata svetovna vojna", 64–5.
- 42 Todorov, *Informatsiya za Purviya congress po Balkanistika (26 avgoust—1 septemvri 1966 g.)*. Central State Archives of the Republic of Bulgaria, holding 1b, inventory 6, archive unit 6431, sheet 115.
- 43 *Ibid.*
- 44 *Ibid.*
- 45 *Ibid.*, sheet 111.
- 46 *Ibid.*, sheet 118.
- 47 *Ibid.*
- 48 *Ibid.*, sheet 124.
- 49 Koleva and Elenkov, "Did 'the Change' Happen?"
- 50 Today it is often said that there are no longer historians such as there "once used to be." And that is indeed true. The efforts to reproduce the type of behavior described above in the absence of the circumstances which made this behavior possible and appropriate in the past, undoubtedly lend the actions of its exponents farcical overtones (e.g. Bozhidar Dimitrov and others).
- 51 Brunnbauer, "Historische Anthropologie in Bulgarien", 129–45 and "Nach der Wende und an der Grenze."
- 52 Preschlenova, "Freiheit als Verantwortung", 473–86; Koleva and Elenkov, op. cit.

- 53 Full annotated list of the publications is available at: http://www.archives.government.bg/arhivite_govoriat.php
- 54 Muraviev, *Sabitia i hora. Spomeni*; Malinov, *Pod znaka na ostrasteni i opasni politicheski borbi.*; Filova, *Dnevnik (mai 1939—15 avgust 1944).*; Moshanov,, *Moiata misia v Kairo.*; Mitakov, *Dnevnik na pravosadnia ministar v pravitelstvata na G. Kioseivanov i B. Filov.*
- 55 Boncheva, et al., (eds.), *Bulgarskiat Gulag.*; Bochev, *Belene.*
- 56 Dimitrov, *Dnevnik.*; Chervenkov, *Za sebe si i svoeto vreme.*; Zhivkov, *Memuari.*; Mladenov, *Zhivotut*; Avramov, *50 osporvani godini.*; Todorov, *Do vuruhovete na vlastta.*; Chankov, *Ravnosmetkata.*
- 57 Todorov, VII Veliko narodno sabranie zad kadar.; Videnov, *Otvad politicheskia teatar.*; Zhelev, *V goliamata politika*; Semerdjiev, *Prezhivianoto ne podlezhi na obzhalvane.*
- 58 Dimitrov, *Vsichko teche*; Mutafchieva, *Bivalitsi*; Mutafchieva, *Semeina saga.*
- 59 Limiting ourselves to writers only: Slavov, *Bulgarskata literatura na razmraziavaneto.*; Slavov, *S treva obrasli.*; Tsanev, *Ubiitsite sa mezhdu nas.*; Tsanev, *Vnimavaite s viatarnite melnitsi.*; Levchev, *Ti si sledvashtiat.*; Rainov, *V imeto na otsa.*
- 60 Preshlenova, "Freiheit als Verantwortung", 473–86.
- 61 See Roumen Daskalov's analysis in his: "Se souvenir du socialisme", 41–51. Sociologist Liliana Deyanova published a paper on Georgi Dimitrov's diary in "Dnevnikat na Georgi Dimitrov i mestata na pametta." Linguist Petar Vodenicharov studied mostly pre-1989 (auto)biographies of Communist functionnaires from the perspective of discourse analysis. Vodenicharov, *Ezik, pol i vlast.*
- 62 Todorova (ed.), *Istoritsi za istoriyata.*
- 63 E.g. Assmann, *Kulturnata pamet.*; Koselleck, *Plastovete na vremeto*; Nora (ed.), *Mesta na pamet.*; Mitterauer, *Sotsialna istoria na mladostta*; Dressel, *Istoricheska Antropologia.*
- 64 Malcolm, *Kratka istoriya na Kosovo.*; Lory, *Sadbata na Osmanskoto nasledstvo.*; Kaser, *Priatelstvo i vrazhdi na Balkanite.*; Sugar, *Yugoiztochna Evropa pod osmansko vladichestvo.*
- 65 Kitromilides, *Ot krusta kam flaga.* Recently, a special program of the Soros Center for the Arts was established to encourage translations from/into the languages of the region. Among the supported publications, Inalcik, *Osmanskata imperia* is of direct relevance to our topic.
- 66 Todorova, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria", 1115–6.
- 67 One of the first and most influential is: Elenkov and Daskalov (eds.), *Zashto sme takiva?*
- 68 Genchev, *Naouchni trudove. Vol. 1 (1961–1972); Naouchni trudove. Vol. 2 (1973–2001).* Genchev, *Publicistica. Vol. 3 (1958–1991); Publicistica. Vol. 4 (1992–2001)*
- 69 Nova publichnost, *Bulgarskite debati 1998*; Nova Publichnost, *Bulgarskite debati 1999.*; Nova Publichnost, *Bulgarskite debati 2000.*

- 70 A special issue of this journal (vol. 9, No 2, 2000) was dedicated to a critical debate on Maria Todorova's *Imagining the Balkans* where scholars with various disciplinary backgrounds took part. Symptomatically, another issue of the same journal entirely dedicated to a deconstruction of myths in history and historiography and containing Todorova's paper "Conversion to Islam as a trope in Bulgarian historiography, fiction and film" appeared a year later when historiography still seemed to be busier with the production of myths rather than their critical analysis.
- 71 Cf. e.g., the discussion on fascism in *Demokrateski pregled* 4–5, summer 1996.
- 72 "Bulgaria in Europe and Europe in Bulgaria: pages from history"; "The monarchy and the republic in history."
- 73 Mutafchieva, "Predislovie," in Mutafchieva et al. (eds.), *Sudut nad istoriata*.
- 74 *Sluchaiat "Tiutium" 1951–1952.*; Radev (ed.), *Literaturnite pogromi.*; *Gorianite.*; *Borbi i chistki v BKP (1948–1953).*; *Drugata Bulgaria 1944–1989. Dokumenti za organizatsiite na bulgarskata politicheska emigratsia.*
- 75 E.g., Stoyanova and Iliev, *Politicheski opasni litsa*; Tsvetkov, *Sadat nad opozitsionnite lideri.*; Poppetrov, Meshkova, and Sharlanov, *Bulgarskata gilotina.*; Meshkova and Sharlanov *Kovarnata igra. Protseste "Legionerski tsentar" 1946.*; *"Legionerski tsentar" 1948.*; Angelov, "Razrushitelni udari protiv Nevrokopska eparhia i narodnata ni tsurkva (1944–1948)," 46–58; Angelov, "Malko izvestni i neizvestni protestni dokumenti za denatsionalizatorskata politika na BRP (k) v Pirinska Makedonia (1946–1948)," 59–76; Semerdjiev, *Narodniat sad v Bulgaria 1944–1945.*; Minchev, *Bulgaria otново na krastopat (1942–1946).*; Sharlanov: *Gorianite. Koi sa te?*
- 76 Chichovska, *Mezhdunarodnata kulturna deinost na Bulgaria 1944–1948.*; Chichovska, *Politikata srestu prosvetnata traditsia.*; Miguev, *Kolektivizatsiata na bulgarskoto selo (1948–1958).*; Miguev, *Bulgarskite pisateli i politicheskiat zhivot v Bulgaria 1944–1970.*
- 77 Isusov, "Istoricheskata nauka i nashata suvremennost", 5.
- 78 Ludjev, "Opitat za prehod kum socializum v stranite na Iztochna Evropa", 67–82.
- 79 Kalinova and Baeva, *Bulgarskite prehodi 1939–2002.*
- 80 Ginev, "Teoretizatsiata na sotsializma".
- 81 Georgieva, "Diplomatic Marriages in Medieval Bulgarian Foreign Policy", 116–26; Georgieva, "The Political Activity of Women during the Period of the First Bulgarian Kingdom", 109–14.
- 82 Todorova, "Zhenite v Sofia prez 70-te godini na 17 vek", 3–40; Todorova, "Evolutsia hristianskih vzgliadov na smeshennie braki", 46–62; Todorova, *Zhenite ot Tsentralnite Balkani 15th–17th century*; Ivanova, "Brak i razvod v bulgarskite zemi prez 16–19 vek", 159–93; Ivanova, "Miusulmanki i hristianki pred kadiyskia sud v Rumelia prez 18 vek. Brachni problemi", 76–87.
- 83 Cholakova, *Bulgarskoto zhensko dvizhenie (1857–1878).*

- 84 Daskalova, "Zhenskoto dvizhenie v Bulgaria prez prizmata na edin zhivot: Dimitrana Ivanova", 204–17; Daskalova, "Bulgarian Women in Movements, Laws and Discourses (1840s–1940s)", 180–96; Daskalova, "The Women's Movement in Bulgaria After Communism", 162–175.
- 85 Daskalova (ed.), *Ot siankata na istoriata*.
- 86 Daskalova, "Zhenite i bulgarskata knizhnina, 1878–1944."
- 87 Daskalova, "Feminism and ravnopravie v bulgarskia 20 vek (Feminism and equality in the Bulgarian 20th C)", 80–105.
- 88 A recent publication that came out of such a project is the collection Daskalova (ed.) *Voices of Their Own. Oral History Interviews of Women*.
- 89 More on this topic see in Daskalova: "Die Entwicklung der Frauengeschichte in Bulgarien", 364–73.
- 90 Gavrilova and Daskalova (eds.), *Granitsi na grazhdanstvoto*.
- 91 See the forthcoming volume *Women and National History Writing*, where Daskalova has contributed the chapter on Bulgaria "The politics of a discipline: women historians in 20th-century Bulgaria."
- 92 One of the pioneering works was: Georgieva et al., *Etnicheskata kartina v Bulgaria (prouchvanija 1992 g.)* an attempt at an oral history of the 'vuzroditelen protses' (the forced change of Muslim names), funded by Friedrich-Naumann Stiftung.
- 93 E.g., Vassileva, *Evreite v Bulgaria 1944–1952*; Nazarska: *Bulgarskata darzhava i neinite maltsinstva 1879–1885*.
- 94 Fotev, *Drugiat etnos*; Tomova, *Tsiganite v prehodnia period*.
- 95 Marushiakova and Popov, *Tsiganite v Bulgaria*, a pioneering work on the Roma minority.
- 96 Liégeois, *Romi, tsigani, chergari*; Büchschütz, *Maltsinstvenata politika v Bulgaria. Politikata na BKP kam evrei, romi, pomatsi i turtsi 1944–1989*.
- 97 Zhelyazkova (ed.), *Relations of Compatibility and Incompatibility Between Christians and Muslims in Bulgaria*.
- 98 Zhelyazkova, Aleksiev and Nazarska: *Musulmanskite obshtnosti na Balkanite i v Bulgaria* (volume 1 of the series); Gradeva and Ivanova, *Musulmanskata kultura po Bulgarskite zemi* (vol. 2); Zhelyazkova, *Mezhdú adaptatsiata i nostalgia* (vol. 3); Lozanova and Mikov, *Islam i kultura* (vol. 4) Zhelyazkova (rd.), *Albania i albanskite identichnosti* (vol. 5, in Bulgarian and English); Zhelyazkova (ed.), *'Osobenijat sluchai' Bosna* (vol. 6); Gradeva (ed.), *Istoria na musulmanskata kultura po bulgarskite zemi* (vol. 7); Nielsen and Zhelyazkova (eds.), *Etnologia na sufitskite ordeni—teoria i praktika*.
- 99 E.g. Nyagulov, *Banatskite bulgari*, the first comprehensive study of Banat Bulgarians, a religious, ethnic and cultural minority dispersed in three nation states: Romania, Serbia and Bulgaria, from the period of its formation to the present. Special attention is paid to the self-identification and the mobilization strategies, the forms of ethnic and religious expression and the present ethno-cultural revival in Banat.

- 100 Cf. e.g., Kalkandjieva, *Katolicheskata duhovna kultura i neinoto prisustvie i vlianie v Bulgaria*.
- 101 Ilchev and Mitev, *Dokosvania do Amerika (19th—early 20th century)*.
- 102 Elenkov, *Katolicheskata tsurkva ot iztochen obriad v Bulgaria*.
- 103 Eldarov, *Katolitsite v Bulgaria 1878–1989. Istoricheskoto izsledvane*.
- 104 See e.g., Belovezhkov, *Stradanieto ne e etiket—to e dostoinstvo*; Kalkandjieva, *Bulgarskata pravoslavna tsarkva i darzhavata 1944–1953*.
- 105 Petrunova, Grozdanov and Manolova-Nikolova, *Sveti mesta v Godechko, Dragomansko i Transko*; Valtchinova, *Znepolski pohvali. Lokalna religia i identichnost v Zapadna Bulgaria*.
- 106 E.g., Mishkova, “Literacy and Nation-Building in Bulgaria 1878–1912,” 63–93; Mishkova, “The Nation as Zadruga,” 103–15; Daskalov, “Ideas about and Reactions to Modernization in the Balkans,” 141–80; Daskalov, “Development in the Balkan Periphery Prior to World War Second: Some Reflections,” 207–44.
- 107 Lilova, *Vazrozhdenskite znachenia na natsionalnoto ime*.
- 108 Daskalov, *Kak se misli Bulgarskoto Vuzrazhdane*. English version: Roumen Daskalov, *The making of a nation in the Balkans*.
- 109 Grancharov, *Balkanskiat sviat*.
- 110 Mishkova, *Prisposobiavane na svobodata*.
- 111 Iliev, “On the History of Inventing Bulgarian History.”
- 112 See the memorandum of the Tangra-TanNakRa foundation at <<http://tangra.bitex.com>>.
- 113 Bozhilov, “Razhdaneto na srednovekovna Bulgaria (nova interpretacia),” 3–34. See also: Bozhilov and Gyuzelev, *Istoria na srednovekovna Bulgaria VII–XIV vek*.
- 114 Most notably these are historians of the Middle Ages: Georgi Bakalov, Tsvetelin Stepanov, Georgi Kazakov, but see also Lubomir Ognianov’s work on Bulgarian institutions in the mid-1940s: *Durzhavno-politicheskata sistema v Bulgaria (1944–1948)*.
- 115 The beginning is traceable back to the 1980s with the seminal work of Nikolai Genchev and his team on the Bulgarian Revival intelligentsia.
- 116 Georgieva, *Prostranstvo i prostranstva na bulgarite XV–XVII vek*.
- 117 Manolova-Nikolova, *Chumavite vremena (1700–1850)*.
- 118 Popova, *Natsionalnoto dete. Blagotvoritelnata i prosvetna deinost na Sayuza za zakrila na detsata v Bulgaria 1925–1944*.
- 119 Gergova and Daskalova (eds.), *Istoria na knigata. Knigata v istoriata*.
- 120 Gergova, *Knizhninata i bulgarite (19th—early 20th century)*; Gergova, *Knigoznanie*. See also the volume in her honor: Daskalova (ed.), *Istoria na knigata—nachin na zhivot*. The papers in this book cover a wide range of questions related to the history of the book in Bulgaria, including political influences, censorship, genres, design, etc.
- 121 *Entsiklopedia Bulgarska kniga*.
- 122 Avramov, *Stopanskiat XX vek na Bulgaria*.

- 123 Elenkov, *Rodno i diasno*.
- 124 Danova (ed.), *Predstavata za "drugia" na Balkanite*; Aretov (ed.), *Balkanskite identichnosti v bulgarskata kultura*. Vol. 1–4.; Aretov, *Da mislim Drugoto—obrazi, stereotipi, krizi XVIII–XX vek*; Zaimova and Aretov (eds.) *Modernstva vchera i dnes*.
- 125 One of the earlier books was Daskalov, *Mezhduraznitsa i Zapada. Bulgarski kulturni dilemi*.
- 126 For a detailed account see Brunnbauer, "Historische Anthropologie in Bulgarien. Die schwierige Geburt eines neuen Konzepts", 129–45.
- 127 Gavrilova, *Koleloto na zhivota. Vsekidnevieto na bulgarskia vyzrozhdenski grad*.
- 128 Valtchinova, *Znepolski pohvali. Lokalna religia i identichnost v Zapadna Bulgaria*. A different approach in Manolova and Zheleva, *Letopisni belezhki ot sredna zapadna Bulgaria*, where an attempt is made to reconstruct various aspects of the life in the region to the west of Sofia on the basis of notes on the margins of clerical books.
- 129 Ilchev, *Reklamata prez Vuzrazhdaneto*. It is symptomatic, however, that Professor Ilchev owes his reputation among his colleagues to his more 'mainstream' work on national propaganda during the Balkan wars. Cf. Ilchev, *Rodinata mi—prava ili ne! vumshnopoliticheska propaganda na balkanskite strani 1921–1923*.
- 130 For a more detailed comparative analysis of their approaches see: Brunnbauer, "Nach der Wende und an der Grenze", 124–8.
- 131 Vodenicharov, Popova, and Pashova (eds.), *Iskam chovekat da e vinagi priaten i da si pravim moabet*; Vodenicharov, Popova, and Pashova (eds.), *Moeto dosie, pardon, biografia*; Koleva, Gavrilova, and Elenkova (eds.), *Shuntseto na zalez pak sreshu men*; Daskalova et al. (eds.), *Tehnite sobstveni glasove*. In English: *Voices of Their Own*; Koleva, Gavrilova, and Elenkova (eds.), *Na megdana, na dvete cheshmi. Zhiteiski razkazi ot selo Iskar*.
- 132 *Bulgarski folklor* was the first journal to devote a special issue (No 6 in 1994) to the life-story method presenting both the methods of leading Western figures (Gabriele Rosenthal and Franco Ferraroti), and the work of Bulgarian practitioners. See also No 1–2 for 1998.
- 133 This journal contains regular publications of both original life stories in the rubric 'Togava' (Then) and historical interpretations.
- 134 A special issue on Collective Memory and Biographical Narrative, No 3–4, 1998.
- 135 Cf. Dimitrov, "Review of the book *Etnicheskata kartina na Bulgaria*", 162. The book is an attempt at an oral history of the so-called 'Vuzroditelen process' (the forced change of Turkish names in 1980s).
- 136 <http://www.spomeniteni.org> is the project's site where one can post one's own story and read others' memories.
- 137 Koleva, *Biografija i normalnost*.
- 138 Cf. *Sotsiologicheski problemi* 2 and 4, 1995, dedicated to modernization and feminism respectively; *Ethnic Prejudices*, No 2, 1996 about minorities,

- ethnic stereotypes and social integration; *Historical Sociology of Socialism*, No 1–2, 2003.
- 139 We shall restrict the examples to Margarita Karamihova's papers on types of family in 15–19th century Bulgaria (Karamihova, "Monogamia i poliginia v balgarskoto doindustrialno obstestvo"), and to Darya Vassileva's work on the dwellings of the urban intelligentsia 1878–1912 (Vassileva, "Zhilishteto na gradskata inteligencija 1878–1912"; Vassileva, "Interiorat na zilisteto na balgarskata gradska inteligencija 1878–1912.")
- 140 See e.g. the papers on the socialist family in *Bulgarska etnologia* 2, 2001 by Milena Benovska, Anna Luleva and Ulf Brunnbauer; also Benovska-Sabkova, *Politicheski prehod i vsekidnevna kultura*. The first venture into the exploration of new phenomena in the present, to the best of our knowledge, was Ivanova: "Vsichki zhabi sa zeleni, samo nashta e chervena." See also Miglena Ivanova's paper "Collective and personal identities of Bulgarian graffiti writers and their reflection in life stories" in Koleva (ed.), *Talking History*.
- 141 A special issue (No 6, 1994) on the biographical method; No 5–6, 1997 on narrative; No 4, 1999 on discourses of diversity, etc.
- 142 Trendafilov, *Neizlichimiat obraz v ogledaloto.*; Aretov, *Da mislim Drugoto—obrazi, stereotipi, krizi XVIII–XX vek.*; Aretov, *Bulgarskoto Vazrazhdane i Evropa*; Georgieva-Teneva, *Literatura i istoricheski mit*.
- 143 Peleva, *Botev. Tialoto na natsionalisma*, 5–6.
- 144 The latter is noteworthy for its clearly expressed regional focus and its multidisciplinary orientation.
- 145 Among these periodicals are the following: *Istoricheski pregled* published by the Institute for History at BAS, *Istorichsko badeste*, *Vekove*, and its successor *Minalo* (designed as alternatives to the more traditional *Istoricheski pregled*). To these may be added *Avitohol*, a journal supported by Bulgarian émigrés in the USA, *Rhodopica*, published by the Smolyan Museum of History, etc.
- 146 Gesheva, "Naouchna diskussia za fashizma na Balkanite", 152–6.
- 147 Baikov, "Politicheskata sistema na bourzhoaznoto obshtestvo", 11–25; Parvanova, "Programata na Demokraticheskaya sgovor", 26–38; Nedev, "Prekasnatost ili neprekasnatost na fashistkata diktatura v Bulgaria 1923–1944 g.", 76–83; Radulov, "Osnovni tendencii v bulgarskiya fashizam", 5–64; Tsvetkov, "Originalnost i imitaciya v bulgarskite totalitarni doktrini i organizatii (1919–1939)", 582–601.
- 148 Spassov, "Imalo li e fashizam v Bulgaria?"
- 149 Sharlanov, "Imalo li e fashizam v Bulgaria"
- 150 Tsvetkov and Poppetrov, "Kum tipologiyata na politicheskoto razvitie na Bulgaria prez 30-te godini", 63–78.
- 151 Miguev, "Politicheskata sistema na Bulgaria ot 9 juni 1923 do 9 septemvri 1944 g.", 77–88.
- 152 *Demokraticheski pregled*, 4–5 (1996), 369.

- 153 Poppetrov, "Vuzmozhnostta za dialog ili 'diskusiite' za bulgarskiya fashizam", 382–8; Semkov, "Fashizam-fashizmi: mitove i istoricheska istina", 389–97; Miguev, "Po niakoi problemi na bulgarskia fashizam (1919–1944 g.)", 398–408; Tsvetkov, "Bulgaria i totalitarnoto predizvikatelstvo", 409–18.
- 154 Poppetrov, "Faschismus in Bulgarien. Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung", 199–218; Poppetrov, "Die bulgarische Geschichtswissenschaft über die Probleme des bulgarischen Faschismus", 78–93; Poppetrov, "Die Geschichtsschreibung in der BRD über den Faschismus auf der Balkanhalbinsel", 91–101; Poppetrov, "Bolgarskiy fashizm v balkanskom i evropeyskom kontekste (Kratkoye istoriograficheskoye obozrenie i opyt postroeniya modeli)", 146–74.
- 155 Poppetrov, "Die bulgarische Geschichtswissenschaft", 78.
- 156 *Ibid.*, 79; 85, *passim*.
- 157 Poppetrov, "Bolgarskiy fashizm", 174.
- 158 Migevev, "Politicheskata sistema na Bulgaria", 78.
- 159 *Demokratischenki pregled*, 4–5 (1996), 368–371.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Veselin Angelov, "Razrushitelni udari protiv Nevrokopska eparhia i narodnata ni tsurkva (1944–1948). Neizvestni fakti za likvidatorskoto otnoshenie na komunisticheskata uprava kum nai-mladata bulgarska eparhia," [Destructive blows against Nevrokop diocese and the popular church (1944–1948). Unknown facts about the liquidation attitude of the communist rule towards the newest Bulgarian diocese] in *Minalo* (1 1996), pp. 46–58.
- Veselin Angelov, "Malko izvestni i neizvestni protestni dokumenti za denacionalizatorskata politika na BRP (k) v Pirinska Makedonia (1946–1948)," [Little known and unknown protest documents about the de-nationalisation politics of the Bulgarian Workers' Party (communists) in Pirin Macedonia (1946–1948)] in *Minalo* (1 1997), pp. 59–76.
- Nikolai Aretov ed., *Balkanskite identichnosti v bulgarskata kultura* [Balkan identities in Bulgarian culture] Vol. 1–4. (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2001–2003)
- Nikolai Aretov ed., *Da mislim Drugoto – obrazi, stereotipi, krizi XVIII–XX vek* [Thinking the Other – images, stereotypes, crises 18th–20th c.] (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2001)
- Jan Assmann, *Kulturnata pamet* [Cultural memory] (Sofia: Planeta3, 2001)
- Lachezar Avramov, *50 osporvani godini. Spomeni* [50 contested years. Memories] (Sofia: Teximreklama, 1993)
- Rumen Avramov, *Stopanskiat XX vek na Bulgaria* [The economic 20th century of Bulgaria] (Sofia: Tsentar za liberalni strategii, 2001)

- Baiko Baikov, "Politicheskata sistema na bourzhoazното obshtestvo v Bulgaria v processa na neynata fashizaciya (1934-1939 g.)," [The political system of the bourgeois society in Bulgaria in the process of its fascization (1934-1939)] in *Istorieski pregled* [Historical Review] (6 1987), pp. 11-25.
- Archimandrit Gavril Belovezhov, *Stradanieto ne e etiket – to e dostoinstvo. Dokumenti ot sadebnite protsesi sreshtu katolicheskata tsarkva v Bulgaria prez 50-te godini na XX vek* [The suffering is not a label – it is a virtue. Documents from the trials against the Catholic church in Bulgaria during the 1950s] (Sofia: 2001)
- Milena Benovska-Sabkova, *Politicheski prehod i vsekidnevna kultura* [Political transition and everyday culture] (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 2001)
- Stefan Bochev, *Belene. Skazanie za kontslagera Bulgaria* [Belene. A story about the concentration-camp Bulgaria] (Sofia: Fondacia Bulgarska nauka i kultura, 1999)
- Ekaterina Boncheva et al., eds., *Bulgarskiat Gulag: svideteli. Sbornik dokumentalni razkazi za kontslagerite v Bulgaria* [The Bulgarian GULAG: eyewitnesses. Collection of documental accounts about the concentration camps in Bulgaria] (Sofia: Demokracia, 1991)
- Borbi i chistki v BKP (1948-1953). Dokumenti i materialli* [Struggles and purges in BCP (1948-1953). Documents and materials] (Sofia: ?2001)
- Ivan Bozhilov, "Razhdaneto na srednovkovna Bulgaria (nova interpretaciya)," [The birth of medieval Bulgaria (a new interpretation)] in *Istorieski pregled* [Historical Review] (1-2 1992), pp. 3-34.
- Ulf Brunnbauer ed., *(Re)Writing History. Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004)
- Ulf Brunnbauer, "Historische Anthropologie in Bulgarien. Die schwierige Geburt eines neuen Konzepts" in *Historische Anthropologie* 7 (1 1999), pp. 129-45.
- Ulf Brunnbauer, "Nach der Wende und an der Grenze. Neuorientierungen in der bulgarischen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1989," in Klaus Beitzl und Reinhard Johler (Hg.) *Europäische Ethnologie an der Wende: Perspektiven – Aufgaben – Kooperationen*. (Ethnographisches Museum Schloss Kittsee, 2000)
- Ulrich Büchsenschütz, *Maltsinstvenata politika v Bulgaria. Politikata na BKP kam evrei, romi, pomatsi i turtsi 1944-1989* [The minority politics in Bulgarian. The BCP politics towards Jews, Roma, Pomaks and Turks] (Sofia: IMIR, 2000)
- Georgi Chankov, *Ravnosmetkata. Spomeni i razmisli za revoliutsionnata borba i stroitelstvoto na sotsializma* [The balance-sheet. Memories and thoughts of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism] (Sofia: Hristo Botev, 2000)
- Vulko Chervenkov, *Za sebe si i svoeto vreme* [About myself and my time] (Sofia: LIK, 2000)

- Vessela Chichovska, *Mezhdunarodnata kulturna deinost na Bulgaria 1944-1948* [The international cultural activity of Bulgaria 1944-1948] (Sofia: 1990)
- Vessela Chichovska, *Politikata srestu prosvetnata traditsia* [The politics against the educational tradition] (Sofia: 1995)
- Margarita Cholakova, *Bulgarskoto zhensko dvizhenie (1857-1878)* [The Bulgarian women's movement (1857-1878)] (Sofia: Albo, 1994)
- Nadya Danova ed., *Predstavata za "drugia" na Balkanite* [The image of the "other" in the Balkans] (Sofia: 1995)
- Roumen Daskalov, "Ideas about, and Reactions to Modernization in the Balkans," in *East European Quarterly* 31 (2 1997), pp. 141-80.
- Roumen Daskalov, *Mezhdur Iztoka i Zapada. Bulgarski kulturni dilemi* [Between East and West. Bulgarian cultural dilemmas] (Sofia: LIK, 1998)
- Roumen Daskalov, "Development in the Balkan Periphery Prior to World War Second: Some Reflections," in *Suedost-Forschungen*. Band 57, München, 1998, 207-44.
- Roumen Daskalov, *Kak se misli Bulgarskoto Vuzrazhdane (istoriografsko izsledvane)* (Sofia: LIK, 2002) [English edition: Roumen Daskalov, *The making of a nation in the Balkans. Historiography of the Bulgarian Revival* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004)]
- Roumen Daskalov, "Se souvenir du socialisme: le socialisme dans les Mémoires de quelques grands fonctionnaires Communistes," in *Divinatio* 19 (spring-summer 2004).
- Krassimira Daskalova, "Zhenite i bulgarskata knizhnina, 1878-1944," [Women and Bulgarian book sector 1878-1944] in *Godishnik na Sofiiskia Universitet. Tsentur po kulturoznanie* [Yearbook of the Sofia university] Vol. 86 (1993)
- Krassimira Daskalova, "The Women's Movement in Bulgaria After Communism," Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan and Debra Keats eds., *Transition, Environments, Translations. Feminisms in International Politics* (New York, London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 162-75.
- Krassimira Daskalova, ed., *Ot siankata na istoriata: Bulgarskite zheni mezhdu traditsiata i modernostta* [From the shadow of history: Bulgarian women between tradition and modernity] (Sofia: LIK, 1998)
- Krassimira Daskalova, "Zhenskoto dvizhenie v Bulgaria prez prizmata na edin zhivot: Dimitrana Ivanova," [Women's movement in Bulgaria through the prism of a life: Dimitrana Ivanova] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] 5-6 (1998), pp. 204-17.
- Krassimira Daskalova, "Feminism i ravnopravie v bulgarskia 20 vek," [Feminism and equality in the Bulgarian 20th century] in Ralitsa Muharska ed., *Maiki i dushteri. Pokolenia i possoki v bulgarskia feminism* [Mothers and daughters. Generations and directions in Bulgarian feminism] (Sofia: Polis, 1999), pp. 80-105.
- Krassimira Daskalova, "Bulgarian Women in Movements, Laws and Discourses (1840s-1940s)," in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (1-2 1999), pp. 180-96.

- Krassimira Daskalova, "Die Entwicklung der Frauengeschichte in Bulgarien," in *L'Homme. Zeitschrift für feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 12 (2 2001), pp. 364-73.
- Krassimira Daskalova, ed., *Istoria na knigata – nachin na zhivot* [History of the book – a way of life] (Sofia: LIK, 2002)
- Krassimira Daskalova, ed., *Voices of Their Own. Oral History Interviews of Women*. (Sofia: Polis, 2004) [in Bulgarian 2003]
- Liliana Deyanova, "Dnevnikat na Georgi Dimitrov i mestata na pametta," [Georgi Dimitrov's diary and the places of memory] *Sotsiologicheski problemi* [Sociological Problems] (1-2 2003), pp. 196-207.
- Georgi Dimitrov, *Dnevnik* [Diary] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 1997)
- Ilcho Dimitrov, *Vsichko teche* [Everything flows] (Sofia: Tilia, 2000)
- Strashimir, Dimitrov, "Review of the book *Etnicheskata kartina na Bulgaria*," [The ethnic picture of Bulgaria] in *Istorieski pregled* [Historical Review] (3 1993)
- Rumen Donkov, "Sto godini spetsialnost istoriya v Sofiyskiya universitet 'Sv. Kliment Ohridski,'" [100 years degree programme in history at the Sofia university St. Kliment Ohridski] In *GSU "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," Istorieski fakultet* [Yearbook of the Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski. Faculty of History] Vol. 80, 1987, (Sofia: 1992)
- Gert Dressel, *Istorieska Antropologija* [Historical anthropology] (Makedonia Press, n.d.)
- Drugata Bulgaria 1944–1989. Dokumenti za organizatsiite na bulgarskata politicheska emigratsia* [The other Bulgaria 1944–1989. Documents about the organisations of the Bulgarian political emigrants] (Sofia: Anubis, 2000)
- Svetoslav Eldarov, *Katolitsite v Bulgaria 1878–1989. Istoriesko izsledvane* [The Catholics in Bulgaria 1878–1989. A historical study] (Sofia: IMIR, 2002)
- Ivan Elenkov and Roumen Daskalov eds., *Zashto sme takiva? V tursene na bulgarskata kulturna identichnost* [Why are we as we are? Seeking for Bulgarian cultural identity] (Sofia: Prosveta 1994)
- Ivan Elenkov, *Rodno i diasno* [Native and right-wing] (Sofia: LIK, 1998)
- Ivan Elenkov, *Katolicheskata tsurkva ot iztochen obriad v Bulgaria ot vremeto na neynoto uchrediavane s prisaedinenieto na chast ot bulgarskia narod kam Rim prez 1860 do sredata na XX vek* [The Greek Catholic church in Bulgaria from the time of its founding with the accession of a part of the Bulgarian people to Rome in 1860 till mid-20th c.] (Sofia: Katolicheskaya apostolicheskaya ekzarhia, 2000)
- Ivan Elenkov, *The Science of History in Bulgaria in the Age of Socialism: The Problematic Mapping of Its Institutional Boundaries*. CAS Working Paper 2003.
- Entsiklopedia Bulgarska kniga* [Bulgarian Book Encyclopedia] (Sofia: Pensoft 2004.
- Ekaterina Filova, *Dnevnik (mai 1939 – 15 avgust 1944)* [Diary (May 1939 – 15 August 1944)] (Sofia: 1992)

- Georgi Fotev, *Drugiat etnos* [The other ethnos] (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 1994)
- Rayna Gavrilova, *Koleloto na zhivota. Vsekidnevieto na bulgarskia vyzrozhdenski grad* [The wheel of life. Everyday life in Bulgarian 19th c. towns] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," 1999)
- Rayna Gavrilova and Krassimira Daskalova eds., *Granitsi na grazhdanstvoto: evropeiskite zheni mezhdu traditsiata i modernostta* [Limits of citizenship: European women between tradition and modernity] (Sofia: LIK, 2001)
- Nikolai Genchev, "Ouchitelka na zhivota, no koga?" [Teacher of life, but when?] in *Mladezh* [Youth] (1966)
- Nikolai Genchev, *Naouchni trudove. Vol. 1* (1961–1972); *Naouchni trudove. Vol. 2* (1973–2001) [Scholarly works] Ed. by Miglena Kuyumdjieva. (Sofia: Gutenberg 2003)
- Ivanichka Georgieva et al., *Etnicheskata kartina v Bulgaria (prouchvaniya 1992 g.)* [The ethnic picture in Bulgaria (1992 research)] (Sofia: "Klub 90," 1993)
- Sashka Georgieva, "Diplomatic Marriages in Medieval Bulgarian Foreign Policy," in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (1 1993), pp. 116–26.
- Sashka Georgieva, "The Political Activity of Women during the Period of the First Bulgarian Kingdom," in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (3–4 1996), pp. 109–14.
- Tsvetana Georgieva, *Prostranstvo i prostranstva na balgarite XV–XVII vek* [Space and spaces of the 15th–17th c. Bulgarians] (Sofia: LIK, 1999)
- Ogniana Georgieva-Teneva, *Literatura i istoricheski mit* [Literature and historical myth] (Sofia: Grazhdansko druzestvo Kritika, 2002)
- Ani Gergova, *Knizhninata i bulgarite (19th – ranen 20th vek)* [Books and Bulgarians (19th – early 20th centuries)] (Sofia: BAN 1991)
- Ani Gergova, *Knigoznanie* [Book study] (Sofia: St Kliment Ohridski University Press, 1995)
- Ani Gergova and Krassimira Daskalova eds., *Istoria na knjigata. Knigata v istoriata* [History of the book. The book in history] (Sofia: St Kliment Ohridski University Press, 2001)
- Publicistica. Vol. 3* (1958–1991); *Publicistica. Vol. 4* (1992–2001). Ed. by Miglena Kuyumdjieva and Georgi Valchev. (Sofia: Argo publishing, 2004)
- Yordanka Gesheva, "Naouchna diskussia za fashizma na Balkanite," [A scientific discussion on fascism in the Balkans] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (4 1983), pp. 152–6.
- Dimitri Ginev, "Teoretizatsiata na sotsializma," [The theorizing of socialism] *Kultura* in No 26, 18 June 2004.
- Gorianite* [The gorians (armed anti-communist resistance)] Vol. 1. (Sofia: 2001)
- Rositsa Gradeva and Svetlana Ivanova, *Musulmanskata kultura po Bulgarskite zemi* [Muslim culture in Bulgarian lands] (Sofia: IMIR, 1998)
- Rositsa Gradeva ed., *Istoria na musulmanskata kultura po bulgarskite zemi* [History of Muslim culture in Bulgarian lands] (Sofia: IMIR, 2001)

- Stoycho Grancharov, *Balkanskiat sviat* [The Balkan world] (Sofia: Damian Yakov 2001)
- Vesselin Hadjinikolov, "Naouchnite diskousii v Institutouta za bulgarska istoriya pri BAN," [The scientific discussions at the Institute for Bulgarian history at BAS] in *Izvestiya na Institutouta za bulgarska istoriya* [Bulletin of the Institute for Bulgarian history] vol. 1–2, (1951)
- Vesselin Hadjinikolov, "Polovin vek spisanie Istoricheski Pregled," [Half a century of the journal *Historical Review*] *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (1994–95), pp. 3–21.
- History of Bulgaria in 3 vols.* (Sofia: Anubis 1999) (Vol. 1: Ivan Bozhilov, Vassil Gyuzelev, *Istoria na srednovkovna Bulgaria VII-XIV vek* [History of medieval Bulgaria 7th–14th c.]; Vol. 2: Tsvetana Georgieva, Nikolai Genchev: *Istoria na Bulgaria XV-XIX vek* [History of Bulgaria 15th–17th c.]; Vol. 3: Elena Statelova, Stoycho Grancharov, *Istoria na Nova Bulgaria 1878-1944* [History of modern Bulgaria 1878–1944])
- Ivan Ilchev, *Rodinata mi – prava ili ne! Vunshnopoliticheska propaganda na balkanskite strani 1921-1923* [My country – no matter right or not! Foreign propaganda of Balkan countries 1921–1923] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 1995)
- Ivan Ilchev, *Reklamata prez Vuzrazhdaneto* [The advertising during the Revival] (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 1995)
- Ivan Ilchev and Plamen Mitev, *Dokosvania do Amerika (19th – rannia 20th vek)* [Touching America (19th – early 20th centuries)] (Sofia: Hemimont foundation, 2003)
- Ilia Iliev, "On the History of Inventing Bulgarian History," *IWM Working Paper* 5 (2000), <<http://www.iwm.at/>>.
- Mito Isusov, "Istoricheskata nauka i nashata suvremennost," [The science of history and our time] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (1 1991)
- Radost Ivanova, "'Vsichki zhabi sa zeleni, samo nashta e chervena' – grafitite vurhu pametnika na Savetskata armia i Mavzolea," ["All frogs are green, only ours is red" – the graffiti on the monument to the Soviet Army and the Mausoleum] in *Bulgarska etnologia* [Bulgarian Ethnology] (1 1995), pp. 71–84.
- Svetlana Ivanova, "Brak i razvod v bulgarskite zemi prez 16-19 vek," [Marriage and divorce in Bulgarian lands in 16th–19th c.] in *Izvestia na Narodnata Biblioteka "Sv. Sv. Kiril I Metodii"* [Bulletin of the National library St. st. Cyril and Methodius] 22(28) (1994), pp. 159–93.
- Svetlana Ivanova, "Miusulmanki i hristianki pred kadiyskia sud v Rumelia prez 18 vek. Brachni problemi," [Muslim and Christian women facing the kadi court in Rumelia in 18th c. Marital problems] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (10 1992), pp. 76–87.
- Evgenia Kalinova and Iskra Baeva, *Bulgarskite prehodi 1939-2002* [Bulgarian transitions 1939–2002] (Sofia: Paradigma 2002)

- Daniela Kalkandjieva, *Bulgarskata pravoslavna tsarkva i darzhavata 1944-1953* [The Bulgarian Orthodox church and the state 1944–1953] (Sofia: 1997)
- Daniela Kalkandjieva, *Katolicheskata duhovna kultura i neinoto prisustvie i vlianie v Bulgaria* [Catholic culture and its presence and influence in Bulgaria] (Sofia: Albatros, 1997)
- Margarita Karamihova, “Monogamia i poliginia v bulgarskoto doindustrialno obstestvo,” [Monogamy and polygamy in Bulgarian pre-industrial society] in *Bulgarska etnografia* [Bulgarian Ethnography] (1 1991), pp. 59–65.
- Karl Kaser, *Priatelstvo i vrazhdi na Balkanite. Evrobalkanski predizvikatelstva* [Friendship and hostilities on the Balkans] (Sofia: Voenno izd., 2003)
- Paschalis Kitromilides, *Ot krusta kam flaga. Aspekti na hristianstvoto i nacionalizma na Balkanite* [From the cross to the flag. Aspects of Christianity and nationalism on the Balkans] (Sofia: Paradigma, 1999)
- Daniela Koleva, Rayna Gavrilova, and Vanya Elenkova eds., *Sluntseto na zalez pak sreshtu men* [The setting sun in front of me again] (Sofia: LIK, 1999)
- Daniela Koleva, ed., *Talking History*. (Sofia: LIK, 2000)
- Daniela Koleva, *Biografia i normalnost* [Biography and normality] (Sofia: LIK, 2002)
- Daniela Koleva and Ivan Elenkov, “Did ‘the Change’ Happen? Post-Socialist Historiography in Bulgaria,” in Brunnbauer (ed.) 2004
- Daniela Koleva, Rayna Gavrilova, and Vanya Elenkova eds., *Na megdana, na dvete cheshmi. Zhiteiski razkazi ot selo Iskar* [In the square, at the two fountains. Life stories from the village of Iskar] (Sofia: Gutenberg, 2004)
- Reinhart Koselleck, *Plastovete na vremeto* [Layers of time] (Sofia: Dom na naukite za choveka i obshtestvoto, 2002)
- D. Kossev, D. Angelov, E. Bouzhaski, V. Velkov, H. Gandev, M. Issoussov, B. Mateev, N. Todorov, A. Fol, K. Sharova, “Osnovni etapi v razvitiето na bulgarskata istoricheska naouka sled Vtorata svetovna vojna,” [Major stages of the development of the science of history after WWII in Bulgaria] in *Problemi na bulgarskata istoriografiya sled vtorata svetovna vojna* [Problems of Bulgarian historiography after WWII] (Sofia: 1972)
- Liubomir Levchev, *Ti si sledvashtiat* [You are the next] (Sofia: 1998)
- Jean-Pierre Liégeois, *Romi, tsigani, chergari* [Roma, gypsies, vagabonds] (Sofia: Litavra, 1999)
- Dessislava Lilova, *Vazrozhdenskite znachenia na natsionalното ime* [The meanings of the Bulgarian national name during the Revival period] (Sofia: Prosveta, 2003)
- Bernard Lory, *Sadbata na Osmanskoto nasledstvo. Bulgarska gradska kultura 1878-1900* [The fate of the Ottoman heritage. Bulgarian urban culture 1878–1900] (Sofia: Amicitia, 2002)
- Galina Lozanova and Lubomir Mikov, *Islam i kultura* [Islam and culture] (Sofia: IMIR, 1999)
- Dimitar Ludjev, “Opitat za prehod kum socializum v stranite na Iztochna Evropa,” [The attempt at transition to socialism in the countries of Eastern Europe] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (1 1990), pp. 67–82.

- Noel Malcolm, *Kratka istoriya na Kosovo* [Brief history of Kosovo] (Sofia: LIK, 2000)
- Aleksandar Malinov, *Pod znaka na ostrasteni i opasni politicheski borbi* [In a spirit of passionate and dangerous political struggles] (Sofia: 1991) [1934].
- Nadya Manolova and Penka Zheleva, *Letopisni belezhki ot sredna zapadna Bulgaria* [Chronicle notes from mid-western Bulgaria] (Sofia: LIK, 1999)
- Nadya Manolova-Nikolova, *Chumavite vremena (1700-1850)* [The plague times (1700–1850)] (Sofia: IF-94 and IMIR, 2004)
- Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov, *Tsiganite v Bulgaria* [The gypsies in Bulgaria] (Sofia: "Klub 90", 1993)
- Georgi Markov, "50 godini Institut po istoriya pri BAN," [50 years Institute of History at BAS] *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (1–2 1998)
- B. Mateev, "Edinniyat tsentur po istoriya pri BAN prez 1972 g.," [The Integrated Centre of History at BAS in 1972] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (3 1973)
- Pavlina Meshkova and Dinio Sharlanov, *Kovarnata igra. Protsesite "Legionerski tsentar" 1946; "Legionerski tsentar" 1948* [The treacherous game. The trials "Legioner's centre" 1946 "Legioner's centre" 1948] (Sofia: 1995)
- Vladimir Migeu, "Politicheskata sistema na Bulgaria ot 9 yuni 1923 do 9 septemvri 1944 g.," [The political system of Bulgaria from 9 June 1923 till 9 September 1944] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (9 1990), pp. 77–88.
- Vladimir Migeu, *Kolektivizatsiata na bulgarskoto selo (1948–1958)* [The collectivisation of the Bulgarian village (1948–1958)] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Stopanstvo" 1995)
- Vladimir Migeu, "Po niakoi problemi na bulgarskia fashizam (1919-1944 g.)," [On some problems of the Bulgarian fascism (1919–1944)] in *Demokraticheski pregled* [Democratic Review], (4–5 1996), pp. 398–408.
- Vladimir Migeu, *Bulgarskite pisateli i politicheskiat zhivot v Bulgaria 1944-1970* [Bulgarian writers and the political life in Bulgaria 1944–1970] (Sofia: 2001)
- Mincho Minchev, *Bulgaria ot novo na krastopat (1942-1946)* [Bulgaria at cross-roads again (1942–1946)] (Sofia: Tilia, 1999)
- Diana Mishkova, "Literacy and Nation-Building in Bulgaria 1878–1912," in *East European Quarterly* 28 (1 1994), pp. 63–93.
- Diana Mishkova, *Prispособiavane na svobodata. Modernost – legitimnost v Sarbia i Rumania prez XIX vek* [Domestication of freedom. Modernity – legitimacy in Serbia and Romania in 19th c.] (Sofia: Paradigma, 2001)
- Diana Mishkova, "The Nation as Zadruga: Re-mapping Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Southeast Europe." in M. Dogo and G. Franzinetti (Eds.), *Disrupting and Reshaping: Early Stages of Nation-Building in the Balkans*. (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 2001), pp. 103–15.
- V. Mitakov, *Dnevnik na pravosadnia ministar v pravitelstvata na G. Kioseivanov i B. Filov* [Diary of the justice minister in G. Kioseivanov's and B. Filov's governments] (Sofia: Trud, 2001)
- Michael Mitterauer, *Sotsialna istoria na mladostta* [Social history of youth] (Sofia: Variant2000, 2004)

- Petar Mladenov, *Zhivotut. Plusove i minusi* [Life. Pluses and minuses] (Sofia: Peteks, 1992)
- Stoicho Moshanov, *Moiata misia v Kairo* [My mission in Kairo] (Sofia: 1991)
- Konstantin Muraviev, *Sabitia i hora. Spomeni* [Events and people. Memories] (Sofia: Trud, 1992)
- Konstantin Muraviev, *Semeina saga. Razgadavaiki basha si* [Family saga. Unriddling my father] (Sofia: Gutenberg, 2000)
- Vera Mutafchieva, *Bivalitsi*. 3 vols [Things past] (Sofia: Anubis, 2000–2003)
- Vera Mutafchieva, V. Chichovska, D. Ilieva, E. Noncheva, Z. Nikolova, Ts. Velichkova eds., *Sudut nad istoritsite. Bulgarskata istoricheska naouka – dokumenti i diskussii 1944–1950* [The Trial against the Historians. The Bulgarian Historical Science – documents and discussions 1944–1950] Vol. 1 (Sofia: Akad. izdatelstvo M. Drinov, 1995)
- Zhorzheta Nazarska, *Bulgarskata darzhava i neinite maltsinstva 1879–1885* [The Bulgarian state and its minorities 1879–1885] (Sofia: LIK, 1999)
- Nedio Nedev, “Prekasnatost ili neprekasnatost na fashistkata diktatura v Bulgaria 1923–1944 g.,” [Discontinuity or continuity of the fascist dictatorship in Bulgaria 1923–1944] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (8 1989), pp. 76–83.
- Jorgen Nielsen and Antonina Zhelyazkova eds., *Etnologia na sufitskite ordeni – teoria i praktika* [Ethnology of the Sufi orders – theory and practice] (Sofia: IMIR, 2001)
- Pierre Nora, ed., *Mesta na pamet* [Places of memory] Vol. 1. (Sofia: Dom na naukite za choveka i obshtestvoto, 2004)
- Pierre Nora, *Nova Publichnost: Bulgarskite debati 1998* [New publicity: Bulgarian debates 1998] (Sofia: Fondatsia Otvoreno obshtestvo, 1999)
- Pierre Nora, *Bulgarskite debati 1999* [New publicity: Bulgarian debates 1999] (Sofia: Fondatsia Otvoreno obshtestvo, 2000)
- Pierre Nora, *Bulgarskite debati 2000* [New publicity: Bulgarian debates 2000] (Sofia: Fondatsia Otvoreno obshtestvo, 2001)
- Blagovest Nyagulov, *Banatskite bulgari* [The Banat Bulgarians] (Sofia: Paradigma, 1999)
- Lubomir Ognianov, *Durzhavno-politicheskata sistema v Bulgaria (1944–1948)* [The state-political system in Bulgaria (1944–1948)] (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 1993)
- Rumiana Parvanova, “Programata na Demokraticheskiya sgovor,” [The programme of the Democratic agreement] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (6 1987), pp. 26–38.
- Inna Peleva, *Botev. Tialoto na natsionalisma* [Botev. The body of nationalism] (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 1998)
- Boni Petrunova, Valeri Grozdanov, Nadya Manolova-Nikolova, *Sveti mesta v Godechko, Dragomansko i Transko* [Sacred places in the region of Godech, Dragoman and Trun] (Sofia: LIK, 2000)
- Stefan Popov, *Bezsaniitsi* [Sleeplessness] (Sofia: 1992)

- Kristina Popova, *Natsionalnoto dete. Blagotvoritelnata i prosvetna deinost na Sayuza za zakrila na detsata v Bulgaria 1925-1944* [The national child. Charity and educational activities of the Child Protection union in Bulgaria 1925–1944] (Sofia: LIK, 1999)
- Nikolai Poppetrov, "Faschismus in Bulgarien. Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung," in *Südost-Forschungen* (41 1982), pp. 199–218.
- Nikolai Poppetrov, "Die bulgarische Geschichtswissenschaft über die Probleme des bulgarischen Faschismus," in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (3 1986), pp. 78–93.
- Nikolai Poppetrov, "Die Geschichtsschreibung in der BRD über den Faschismus auf der Balkanhalbinsel," in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (3 1988), pp. 91–101.
- Nikolai Poppetrov, "Bolgarskiy fashizm v balkanskom i evropeyskom kontekste (Kratkoye istoriograficheskoye obozrenie i opyt postroeniya modeli)," [The Bulgarian fascism in a Balkan and European context (A brief historiographical overview and an attempt at building a model)] in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (1 1993), pp. 146–74.
- Nikolai Poppetrov, "Vuzmozhnostta za dialog ili 'diskusiite' za bulgarskiya fashizam," [The possibility of a dialogue or the 'discussions' on Bulgarian fascism] *Demokratischenki Pregled* [Democratic Review] (4–5 1996), pp. 382–8.
- Nikolai Poppetrov, Pavlina Meshkova, and Dinio Sharlanov, *Bulgarskata gilotina. Taynite mehanizmi na narodnia sud* [The Bulgarian guillotine. The secret mechanisms of the people's court] (Sofia: Demokracia, 1994)
- Rumiana Preschlenova, "Freiheit als Verantwortung. Die Historiographie in Bulgarien nach dem Umbruch," in *Österreichische Osthefte* Sonderband 16 (Heft 1-2/2002), pp. 473–86;
- Ivan Radev ed., *Literaturnite pogromi. Porachkovi "ubiistva" v novata ni literatura* [The literary pogroms. Commissioned 'murders' in our new literature] (Veliko Tarnovo: 2001)
- Stefan Radulov, "Osnovni tendencii v bulgarskiya fashizam," [Major tendencies in Bulgarian fascism] in *Izvestiya na Instituta po Istoria na BKP* [Bulletin of the Institute for BCP history] (63 1989), pp. 5–64.
- Bogomil Rainov, *V imeto na otsa* [In the name of the father] (Sofia: 2002)
- "Reshenie na Politburo na CK na BKP za mnogotomna istoriya na Bulgaria," [Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of BCP for a multi-volume History of Bulgaria] in *Istoriicheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (5 1968)
- Atanas Semerdjiev, *Prezhivianoto ne podlezhi na obzhalvane* [The experienced is not subject to appeal] (Sofia: 1999)
- Petar Semerdjiev, *Narodniat sad v Bulgaria 1944-1945* [The People's court in Bulgaria 1944–45] (Blagoevgrad: Makedonia press, 1998)
- Milen Semkov, "Fashizam-fashizmi: mitove i istoricheska istina," [Fascism-fascisms: myths and historical truth] in *Demokratischenki pregled* [Democratic Review] (4–5 1996), pp. 389–97.

- Dinio Sharlanov, "Imalo li e fashizam v Bulgaria," [Was there fascism in Bulgaria?] in *Savremenien Pokazatel* [Contemporary Indicator] (29 March 1990)
- Dinio Sharlanov, *Gorianite. Koi sa te?* [The goriani. Who are they?] (Sofia: 1999)
- Atanas Slavov, *Bulgarskata literatura na razmrzhiavaneto* [Bulgarian literature of the thaw] (Sofia: 1994)
- Atanas Slavov, *S treva obrasli* [In grass overgrown] (Sofia: 1992)
- Sluchaiat "Tiutium" 1951-1952. *Stenogrami, statii, retsenzii, spomeni* [The 'To-bacco' case 1951-1952. Minutes, articles, reviews, memories] (Sofia: 1992)
- Mircho Spassov, "Imalo li e fashizam v Bulgaria?" [Was there fascism in Bulgaria?] in *Demokracia* [Democracy] No. 13 (28 February 1990)
- Luchezar Stoyanov, "Seksitiya 'Istoriya na bulgarskiya natsionalen vupros,'" [The department of The History of the Bulgarian national question] in *Petdeset godini institut po istoriya pri BAN 1947-1997* [50 years of the Institute of History at BAS] Editorial Board: Valeri Stoyanov (Editor-in-Chief), Antoaneta Zapryanova (Sofia: 1999)
- Penka Stoyanova and Emil Iliev, *Politicheski opasni litsa – vadvoriavania, trudova mobilizatsia, izselvania sled 1944* [Politically dangerous persons – internments, labour mobilisation, resettlements after 1944] (Sofia: 1991)
- Peter Sugar, *Yugoiztochna Evropa pod osmansko vladichestvo* [Southeast Europe under Ottoman rule] (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 2003)
- Goran D. Todorov, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria,'" [Discussion of the 'dummy' of vol. 1 of The History of Bulgaria] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (4 1955)
- Nikolai Todorov, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria' v Suvetskiya suyuz," [Discussion of the 'dummy' of vol. 1 of The History of Bulgaria in the Soviet Union] *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review], 1, 1954, pp. 116-126.
- Nikolai Todorov, "Sustoyanie i zadachi na bulgarskata istoricheska naouka," [State and tasks of the Bulgarian science of history] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (5 1975)
- Nikolai Todorov, *VII Veliko narodno sabranie zad kadar* [7th Great National assembly behind the curtain] (Sofia: 1993)
- Stanko Todorov, *Do vurhovete na vlastta. Politicheski memoari 1941-1991* [To the summits of power. Political memoirs 1941-1991] (Sofia: Hristo Botev, 1995)
- Maria Todorova, ed., *Istoritsi za istoriyata* [Historians on history] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," 1988)
- Maria Todorova, "Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria," in *American Historical Review* 4 (October 1992)
- Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Maria Todorova, ed., *National Identities and National Memories in the Balkans* (New York: New York University Press, 2003)

- Olga Todorova, "Zhenite v Sofia prez 70-te godini na 17 vek (po dannii ot edin registar s nasledstveni opisi)," [The women in Sofia in the 1670s (according to data from an inheritance register)] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (3 1996), pp. 3–40.
- Olga Todorova, "Evolutsia hristianskih vzgliadov na smeshennie braki (hristian s miusulman) v 15–18 vv," [The evolution of the Christian attitudes towards mixed marriages in 15th–18th c.] in *Bulgarian Historical Review* (1 1991) pp. 46–62.
- Olga Todorova, *Zhenite ot Tsentralnite Balkani 15–17 vek* [The women in Central Balkans 15th–17th c.] (Sofia: Gutenberg, 2005)
- Ilona Tomova, *Tsiganite v prehodnia period* [The gypsies in the transition period] (Sofia: IMIR, 1995)
- Vladimir Trendafilov, *Neizlichimiat obraz v ogledaloto. Aktualnata bulgarska retseptsia na Anglia, anglichanina i angliiskata misal prez 19 i nachaloto na 20 vek* [The indelible image in the mirror. The present Bulgarian reception of England, the Englishman and the English thought from the 19th and the beginning of the 20th c.] (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab, 1996)
- Stefan Tsanev, *Ubiitsite sa mezhdu nas* [The murderers are among us] (Sofia: Biblioteka 48, 1996)
- Stefan Tsanev, *Vnimavaite s viatarnite melnitsi* [Be careful with the windmills] (Sofia: 1998)
- Plamen Tsvetkov, "Originalnost i imitaciya v bulgarskite totalitarni doktrini i organizacii (1919–1939)," [Originality and imitation in Bulgarian totalitarian doctrines and organisations (1919–1939)] *Vtori kongress po bulgaristika* [Second congress in Bulgarian studies], vol. 23 (Sofia: 1989), pp. 582–601.
- Plamen Tsvetkov and Nikolai Poppetrov, "Kum tipologiyata na politicheskoto razvitie na Bulgaria prez 30-te godini," [Towards the typology of the political development of Bulgaria during the 1930s] in *Istoricheski pregled* [Historical Review] (2 1990), pp. 63–78.
- Plamen Tsvetkov, "Bulgaria i totalitarnoto predizvikatelstvo," [Bulgaria and the totalitarian challenge] in *Demokraticheski pregled* [Democratic Review] (4–5 1996), pp. 409–18.
- Zhoro Tsvetkov, *Sadat nad opozitsionnite lideri* [The trial against the oppositional leaders] (Sofia: 1991)
- Vasilka Tupkova-Zaimova, "Obsuzhdane na maketa na t. I ot 'Istoriya na Bulgaria'," [Discussion of the 'dummy' of vol. 1 of The History of Bulgaria] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (1 1954)
- Galina Valtchinova, *Znepolski pohvali. Lokalna religia i identichnost v Zapadna Bulgaria* [Eulogies from Znepole. Local religion and identity in western Bulgaria] (Sofia: Marin Drinov, 1999)
- V. A. Vassilev, "Obsuzhdane na porazheniyata, naneseni ot culta kum lichnosta v istoricheskata naouka," [Discussion of the damages incurred by the personality cult on the science of history] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (2 1963)

- V. A. Vassilev, "Rabotata po istoriya na Bulgaria na nov etap," [The work on the History of Bulgaria at a new stage] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (2 1973)
- V. A. Vassilev, "Akademik Dimitar Kossev kakuvto go vidyah i zapomnih," [Academic Dimitar Kossev as I saw and remembered him] in *Istoricheski Pregled* [Historical Review] (1 1997)
- Boyka Vassileva, *Evreite v Bulgaria 1944-1952* [The Jews in Bulgaria 1944–1952] (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "St. Kliment Ohridski," 1992)
- Darya Vassileva, "Zhilishteto na gradskata inteligentia 1878-1912," [The dwelling of urban intelligentsia 1878–1912] in *Bulgarska etnografia* [Bulgarian Ethnography] (5–6 1992), pp. 41–50.
- Zhan Videnov, *Orvad politicheskia teatar* [Beyond the political theatre] (Sofia: Hristo Botev, 1998)
- Petar Vodenicharov, Kristina Popova, and Anastasia Pashova eds., *Iskam chovekat da e vinagi priaten i da si pravim moabet. Rechevo povedenie i zhiznenni svetove na bulgari mohamedani v Gotse-Delchevsko i Razlozhko* [I want the person to be always nice and to make 'moabet' [small talk]. Speech behaviour and life-worlds of Bulgarian Muslims in the region of Gotse Delchev and Razlog] (Blagoevgrad: Sanra Book Trust, 1998)
- Petar Vodenicharov, *Moeto dosie, pardon, biografia. Bulgarskite modernizatsii (30-te i 60-te godini) – ideologii i identichnosti* [My file, pardon, biography. Bulgarian modernisations (1930s–1960s) – ideologies and identities] (Blagoevgrad: BOASO, 1999)
- Petar Vodenicharov, *Ezik, pol i vlast* [Language, gender and power] (Blagoevgrad: BOASO, 1999)
- Raya Zaimova and Nikolai Aretov eds., *Modernostta vchera i dnes* [Modernity yesterday and today] (Sofia: Kralitsa Mab 2003)
- Zhelio Zhelev, *V goliamata politika* [In the big politics] (Sofia: Helikon, 1998)
- Antonina Zhelyazkova ed., *Relations of Compatibility and Incompatibility Between Christians and Muslims in Bulgaria* (Sofia: IMIR, 1995)
- Antonina Zhelyazkova, Bozhidar Aleksiev, and Zhorzheta Nazarska, *Musulmanskite obshtnosti na Balkanite i v Bulgaria* [Muslim communities in the Balkans and in Bulgaria] (Sofia: IMIR, 1997)
- Antonina Zhelyazkova, *Mezhdur adaptatsiata i nostalgata (bulgarskite turtsi v Turtsija)* [Between adaptation and nostalgia (Bulgarian Turks in Turkey)] (Sofia: IMIR, 1998)
- Antonina Zhelyazkova, ed., *Albania i albanskite identichnosti* [Albania and Albanian identities] (Sofia: IMIR, 2000)
- Antonina Zhelyazkova, ed., *'Osobenijat sluchai' Bosna* [The particular case of Bosnia] (Sofia: IMIR, 2001)
- Todor Zhivkov, *Memoari* [Memoirs] (Sofia: SIV-AD, 1997)

List of Contributors

- Sorin Antohi (b. 1957) specializes in intellectual history, history of ideas, theory and history of historical studies; he has taught at CEU from 1995 to 2006, and is currently Director of Orbis Tertius, Institute of Intercultural Studies, Bucharest.
- Péter Apor (b. 1971) is research fellow at Pasts Inc., Center for Historical Studies, CEU. His research interests include the politics of history and memory in Communist and post-Communist Central and Eastern Europe and historical anthropology.
- Ivan Elenkov (b. 1956) is Associate Professor at the Department of History and Theory of Culture, St. Kliment Ohridski University, Sofia. He works on twentieth-century Bulgarian social and political history and Bulgarian historiography.
- Maciej Górny (b. 1976) specializes in the history of science and ideas in East Central Europe. He is currently research fellow at the Center for Historical Research at the Polish Academy of Sciences in Berlin.
- Zora Hlavičková (Gonczarow) (b. 1974) specializes in Central European history and historiography; between 1994-2003 studied in Prague, Budapest, Bratislava, Cracow and Vienna; currently lives in London and works in Urban Regeneration.
- Pavel Kolář (b. 1974) specializes in the history of historical studies and historical culture, and the history of Communist dictatorships in East Central Europe; researcher at Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung in Potsdam since 2003.
- Daniela Koleva (b. 1961) is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, St. Kliment Ohridski University, Sofia. Works on historical anthropology and cultural studies, published extensively on gender history and oral history.

Michal Kopeček (b. 1974) is research fellow at the Institute of Contemporary History, Prague. His research interests include modern intellectual history in East Central Europe, theory and history of historiography, nationalism and post-Communist transition.

Cristina Petrescu (b.1964) teaches recent history and ethnohistory at the University of Bucharest. Her research interests include the nation-building processes and the radical ideologies of the twentieth century in East Central Europe.

Dragoş Petrescu (b. 1963) teaches modern history at the University of Bucharest. He is also a member of the Board of the National Council for the Study of the *Securitate* Archives. His research focuses on the comparative study of Communist dictatorships in East Central Europe.

Balázs Trencsényi (b. 1973) is Assistant Professor of History at the Central European University, Budapest. He specializes in the history of political ideas in East Central Europe, early-modern intellectual history and comparative history.